

HOW TO SERVE THE COW

By
M. K. GANDHI

~~6558~~



NAVAJIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE
AHMEDABAD

3053

BOOKS BY GANDHIJI

Rs.nP.

An Autobiography	
(Cardboard-bound)	3.00
(Paper-bound)	2.00
(Abridged)	2.00
(School)	1.50
Ashram Observances in Action	1.00
Christian Missions	2.00
Constructive Programme	0.37
Drink, Drugs & Gambling	2.00
Economic & Industrial Life & Relations, 3 Vols.	8.00
Evil wrought by the English Medium	0.25
From Yeravda Mandir	0.37
Gokhale — My Political Guru	1.00
Hind Swaraj	0.50
Hindu Dharma	4.00
Homage to the Departed	2.50
India of My Dreams	2.50
Khadi — Why and How	3.00
Mohan-mala	1.00
Nature Cure	0.75
Panchayat Raj	0.30
Satyagraha	4.00
Selections from Gandhi	2.00
Self-restraint V.	
Self-indulgence	2.00
Thoughts on National Language	2.00
To Students	2.00
Towards Non-violent Socialism	1.00
Truth is God	1.00
Unto This Last	0.37
Women	1.00

Postage etc. extra



3053

HOW TO SERVE THE COW



✓ 6558
~~3052~~
SD

By
M. K. GANDHI

Edited by
BHARATAN KUMARAPPA

Presented by:-
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
WEST BENGAL



NAVAJIVAN PUBLISHING HOUSE
AHMEDABAD

First Edition, 3,000 Copies, November, 1954

Reprint, 7,000 Copies, January, 1959

One Rupee

U. P. LIBRARY

28.2.2002

10445

© Navajivan Trust, 1954

Printed and Published by Jivanji Dahyabhai Desai
Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad-14



6558

EDITOR'S NOTE

Although the title of this book refers only to the cow, the book itself deals with the broader question of cattle in India. *Goseva*, the Hindi word which Gandhiji used generally for what is treated in this book, means literally cow service. But *Go* in Hindi means not merely cow but also cattle in general. In fact, for Gandhiji *Goseva* meant not only service of cattle but of all that are weak and helpless, whether human or animal. *Goseva* to him was non-violence or love in relation to those incapable of improving their own lot. Therefore, it was love in its noblest form.

It was to the credit of Hinduism that it had taught such love for animal creation, and symbolized it by inculcating love for cattle. Gandhiji could draw on this heritage to bring home to our people the great need for us to look after our cattle, improve their breed and prevent cruelty to them.

Unfortunately, the doctrine of non-violence to cattle had degenerated through the centuries till in our day it amounted merely to seeing that cattle were not slaughtered by Muslims and others for food purposes. In the process, even human blood was spilt. Gandhiji condemned in no uncertain terms this gross perversion of a noble ideal. He sought to revive the fuller and positive significance of cow service and laid down in detail the constructive lines along which it should express itself.

The very fact that there is persistent clamour even now for legislation against cow slaughter, while very little is being done really for improvement of cattle and their lot, shows the great need for a wider knowledge of Gandhiji's teachings in this respect.

Besides Gandhiji's writings in full, or in the form of extracts, dealing with this topic, a few contributions by others, which Gandhiji regarded as helpful and which he therefore published in his journals, are here included.

The arrangement of the matter is ours and in some cases the titles of articles also.

Bombay
November, 1954

Bharatan Kumarappa

NON-ENGLISH WORDS WITH THEIR MEANINGS

- Ahimsa* — non-violence ; love
Arya Samajist — member of a reformed sect of Hinduism
Ashram — place of spiritual retirement ; Gandhiji's colony of workers
Brahmacharya — chastity ; conduct characteristic of one seeking to realize God
Chamars — leather workers
Daridranarayana — God in the form of the poor
Dharma — duty ; religion
Diwan — prime minister in an Indian State
Gayatri — Vedic prayer addressed to the Sun God
Ghanchi — oil-man
Ghani — oil-press run by bullock
Ghat — pass or passage over a hill
Ghi, Ghee — clarified butter
Gita — a sacred book of Hindus
Gopala, Gwala — cowherd, milkman
Goraksha — cow protection
Goshala — dairy
Goseva — cow service
Goseva Sangh — Association for service of the cow
Gosevak — one who would work to serve the cow
Goval — cowherd, milkman
Gwali — milkwoman
Hat — market held periodically, once every week or fortnight
Id, Bakr-Id — a Muslim festival
Kamadhenu — the fulfiller of every desire ; the giver of plenty
Khadi — hand-spun, hand-woven cloth
Koran — sacred book of Muslims
Lakh — one hundred thousand

- Mahajan* — leading men of a village
- Mantra* — pithy slogan, believed in some cases to have spiritual or magical effect
- Pandit* — a learned man; a conventional title for a Brahmana
- Pariah* — outcaste
- Pekhana* — latrine
- Phooka* — process of inserting a rod or pipe into the reproductive organ of the cow and blowing air into it to make the cow yield its last drop of milk
- Pinjrapol* — home for decrepit cattle
- Rakh* — pasture, grazing land
- Rishi* — seer
- Sabha* — association
- Sanatanist* — orthodox Hindu
- Shariat* — Muslim law
- Shastra-pooja* — worship of one's tools
- Shastras* — sacred books
- Swaraj, Swarajya* — self-government
- Tapasya* — penance, voluntary suffering
- Tilak* — a mark on the forehead, often indicating caste or sect
- Vahana* — vehicle or animal on which one rides
- Vaidya* — doctor practising Indian medicine
- Vaishnava* — a sect of Hinduism worshipping Vishnu to which Gandhiji belonged
- Zamindar* — landlord

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
EDITOR'S NOTE	iii
NON-ENGLISH WORDS WITH THEIR MEANINGS	v
<i>Part One : By Gandhiji</i>	
SECTION ONE: COW PROTECTION IN HINDUISM	
1 SAVE THE COW	3
2 COW PROTECTION	3
3 MOTHER COW	4
4 COW PROTECTION	5
5 THE WIDER MEANING OF COW PROTECTION	6
SECTION TWO: OUR FAILURE TO PROTECT THE COW	
6 OUR CRUELITIES	7
7 OUR GUILT	8
8 MAN'S INHUMANITY	10
9 OUR CATTLE	12
SECTION THREE: COW PROTECTION v. MUSLIMS	
10 COW PROTECTION	13
11 BEFRIEND MUSALMANS	15
12 CONVERT BY LOVE	16
13 HINDU RESPONSIBILITY FOR CATTLE DESTRUCTION	17
SECTION FOUR: LEGISLATION AGAINST COW SLAUGHTER	
14 COW KILLING	19
15 STATES AND COW SLAUGHTER	20
16 OUR RESPONSIBILITY FOR COW SLAUGHTER	25
17 COW SLAUGHTER	25
SECTION FIVE: HOW WE MAY SERVE THE COW	
18 HOW TO SAVE THE COW ?	29
19 HOW TO SAVE OUR SURPLUS CATTLE ?	29
20 HOW TO SAVE UNECONOMIC COWS ?	31
21 TANNERIES AND DAIRIES	33
22 AN IDEAL DAIRY	34
23 A SCHEME FOR TANNERIES AND DAIRIES	35
24 CONDITIONS OF COW PROTECTION	37
25 TANNING AND DAIRYING IN CITIES	39
26 COW PROTECTION AND TANNERIES	39
27 PINJRAPOLS	43
28 INDIVIDUAL OR COLLECTIVE ?	44

29	DAIRIES	48
30	DRY COWS FOR PLOUGHING	49
31	BARREN COWS	50
32	COWS FOR PLOUGHING	51
	SECTION SIX: BUFFALO v. COW	
33	BUFFALO BREEDING TO BE GIVEN UP	52
34	COW v. BUFFALO ? OR COW <i>cum</i> BUFFALO ?	52
35	COW'S MILK v. BUFFALO'S	56
36	BUFFALO v. COW	59
37	THE COW AND THE BUFFALO	61
	SECTION SEVEN: GHEE	
38	COW'S GHEE v. BUFFALO'S GHEE	64
39	ADULTERATION OF GHEE	64
40	THE PROBLEM OF GHEE	65
41	COW AND BUFFALO GHEE	66
	SECTION EIGHT: MISCELLANEOUS	
42	FAECES AS CATTLE FOOD	67
43	MARCH OF CIVILIZATION	68
44	BOOK ON THE COW	70
	SECTION NINE: ASSOCIATION FOR SERVICE OF THE COW	
45	GOSEVA SANGH	71
46	GOSEVA SANGH (Cow Service Association)	73
47	GOSEVA SANGH RESOLUTIONS	80
48	GOSEVA	82
	<i>Part Two: By Others</i>	
49	COW PROTECTION IN HINDUISM (By P.)	85
50	COW SLAUGHTER (By J. C. Kumarappa)	90
51	REFORM OF PINJRAPOLS (By William Smith)	92
52	CATTLE IMPROVEMENT CO-OPERATIVE SCHEME (By William Smith)	95
53	CATTLE BREEDING (By William Smith)	99
54	OUR PINJRAPOLS (By Y. M. Parnerkar)	102
55	SAVE THE COW FROM TANNERS (By Satish Chandra Das Gupta)	105
56	GOSHALAS AND PINJRAPOLS (Scheme of Sardar Datar Singh)	108
57	SARDAR DATAR SINGH'S SUGGESTIONS (By A. K.)	111
58	COW BREEDING (By Vinoba Bhawe)	113
	INDEX	115

HOW TO SERVE THE COW

PART ONE — BY GANDHIJI

SECTION ONE: COW PROTECTION IN HINDUISM

1

SAVE THE COW

Cow worship means to me worship of innocence. For me, the cow is the personification of innocence. Cow protection means the protection of the weak and the helpless. As Professor Vaswani truly remarks, cow protection means brotherhood between man and beast. It is noble sentiment that must grow by patient toil and *tapasya*. Rishis of old are said to have performed penance for the sake of the cow. Let us follow in the footsteps of the Rishis, and ourselves do penance, so that we may be pure enough to protect the cow and all that the doctrine means and implies.

Young India, 8-6-'21

2

COW PROTECTION

The central fact of Hinduism is cow protection. Cow protection to me is one of the most wonderful phenomenon in human evolution. It takes the human being beyond his species. The cow to me means the entire sub-human world. Man through the cow is enjoined to realize his identity with all that lives. Why the cow was selected for apotheosis is obvious to me. The cow was in India the best companion. She was the giver of plenty. Not only did she

give milk, but she also made agriculture possible. The cow is a poem of pity. One reads pity in the gentle animal. She is the mother to millions of Indian mankind. Protection of the cow means protection of the whole dumb creation of God. The ancient seer, whoever he was, began with the cow. The appeal of the lower order of creation is all the more forcible because it is speechless. Cow protection is the gift of Hinduism to the world. And Hinduism will live so long as there are Hindus to protect the cow.

Hindus will be judged not by their *tilaks*, not by the correct chanting of *mantras*, not by their pilgrimages, not by their most punctilious observance of caste rules but by their ability to protect the cow.

Young India, 6-10-'21

3

MOTHER COW

Mother cow is in many ways better than the mother who gave us birth. Our mother gives us milk for a couple of years and then expects us to serve her when we grow up. Mother cow expects from us nothing but grass and grain. Our mother often falls ill and expects service from us. Mother cow rarely falls ill. Hers is an unbroken record of service which does not end with her death. Our mother when she dies means expenses of burial or cremation. Mother cow is as useful dead as when she is alive. We can make use of every part of her body — her flesh, her bones, her intestines, her horns and her skin. Well, I say this not to disparage the mother who gives us birth, but in order to show you the substantial reasons for my worshipping the cow.

Harijan, 15-9-'40

COW PROTECTION

A Hindu who protects the cow should protect every animal. But taking all things into consideration, we may not cavil at his protecting the cow because he fails to protect the other animals. The only question therefore to consider is whether he is right in protecting the cow. And he cannot be wrong in so doing if non-killing of animals generally may be regarded as a duty for one who believes in *ahimsa*. And every Hindu, and for that matter every man of religion, does so. The duty of not-killing animals generally and therefore protecting them must be accepted as an indisputable fact. It is then so much to the credit of Hinduism that it has taken up cow protection as a duty. And he is a poor specimen of Hinduism who stops merely at cow protection when he can extend the arm of protection to other animals. The cow merely stands as a symbol, and protection of the cow is the least he is expected to undertake.

The motive that actuates cow protection is not 'purely selfish', though selfish consideration undoubtedly enters into it. If it was purely selfish, the cow would be killed as in other countries after it had ceased to give full use. The Hindus will not kill the cow even though she may be a heavy burden. The numberless *goshalas* that have been established by charitably-minded people for tending disabled and useless cows is in a way an eloquent testimony of the effort that is being made in the direction. Though they are today very poor institutions for the object to be achieved the fact does not detract from the value of the motive behind the act.

Young India, 11-11-'26

THE WIDER MEANING OF COW PROTECTION

[Extract from a speech at the Cow Protection Conference in Belgaum]

In its finer or spiritual sense the term cow protection means the protection of every living creature. Today the world does not fully realize the force and possibilities that lie hidden in *ahimsa*. The scriptures of Christians, Musalmans and Hindus are all replete with the teaching of *ahimsa*. But we do not know its full import. The Rishis of old performed terrible penances and austerities to discover the right meaning of sacred texts. Our Rishis made the startling discovery (and every day I feel more and more convinced of its truth) that sacred texts and inspired writings yield their truth only in proportion as one has advanced in the practice of *ahimsa* and truth. The greater the realization of truth and *ahimsa* the greater the illumination. These same Rishis declared that cow protection was the supreme duty of a Hindu and that its performances brought one *moksha* i.e. salvation. Now I am not ready to believe that by merely protecting the animal cow, one can attain *moksha*. For *moksha*, one must completely get rid of one's lower feelings like attachment, hatred, anger, jealousy etc. It follows, therefore, that the meaning of cow protection in terms of *moksha* must be much wider and far more comprehensive than is commonly supposed. The cow protection which can bring one *moksha* must from its very nature include the protection of everything that feels. Therefore in my opinion, every little breach of the *ahimsa* principle, like causing hurt by harsh speech to any one, man, woman or child, to cause pain to the weakest and the most insignificant creature on earth would be a breach of the principle of cow protection, would be tantamount to the sin of beef-eating — differing from it in degree, if at all, rather than in kind.

Young India, 29-1-'25

SECTION TWO: OUR FAILURE TO PROTECT THE COW

6

OUR CRUELITIES

A Musalman friend sent me some time ago a book detailing the inhumanities practised by us on the cow and her progeny. How we bleed her to take the last drop of milk from her, how we starve her to emaciation, how we ill-treat the calves, how we deprive them of their portion of milk, how cruelly we treat the oxen, how we castrate them, how we beat them, how we overload them. If they had speech, they would bear witness to our crimes against them which would stagger the world. By every act of cruelty to our cattle, we disown God and Hinduism. I do not know that the condition of the cattle in any other part of the world is so bad as in unhappy India. We may not blame the Englishman for this. We may not plead poverty in our defence. Criminal negligence is the only cause of the miserable condition of our cattle. Our *pinjrapols*, though they are an answer to our instinct of mercy, are a clumsy demonstration of its execution. Instead of being model dairy-farms and great profitable national institutions, they are merely depots for receiving decrepit cattle. Whilst professing the religion of cow protection, we have enslaved the cow and her progeny, and have become slaves ourselves.

Young India, 6-10-21

OUR GUILT

[Extract from a speech at the Cow Protection Conference in Belgaum]

Let alone other provinces. Would you believe me if I told you that the Hindus of Gujarat practise cow killing? You will wonder but let me tell you that in Gujarat the bullocks employed for drawing carts are goaded with spiked rods till blood oozes from their bruised backs. You may say that this is not cow killing but bullock killing. But I see no difference between the two, the killing of the cow and killing of her male progeny. Again you may say that this practice may be abominable and worthy of condemnation but it hardly amounts to killing. But here, again, I beg to differ. If the bullock in question had a tongue to speak and were asked which fate he preferred — instantaneous death under the butcher's knife or the long-drawn agony to which he is subjected, he would undoubtedly prefer the former. At Calcutta a Sindhi gentleman used to meet me often. He used always to tell me stories about the cruelty that was practised by milkmen on cows in Calcutta. He asked me to see for myself the process of milking the cows as carried on in the dairies. The practice of blowing is loathsome. The people who do this are Hindus. Again, nowhere in the world is the condition of the cattle so poor as in India. Nowhere in the world would you find such skeletons of cows and bullocks as you do in our cow-worshipping India. Nowhere are bullocks worked so beyond their capacity as here. I contend that so long as these things continue we have no right to ask anybody to stop cow killing. In Bhagawat in one place the illustrious author describes the various things which have been the cause of India's downfall. One of the causes mentioned is that we have given up cow protection. Today I want to

bring home to you if I can the close relation which exists between the present poverty-stricken condition of India and our failure to protect the cow. We, who live in cities, probably can have no idea of the extent of the poverty of our poor folk. Millions upon millions cannot afford to have two full meals per day. Some live on rotten rice only. There are others for whom salt and chillies are the only table luxuries. Is it not a just nemesis for our belying of our religion?

Then in India we have the system of *pinjrapols*. The way in which most of these are managed is far from satisfactory. And yet I am sorry to observe that the people who are mostly responsible for them are Jains who are out and out believers in *ahimsa*. Well organized, these *pinjrapols* ought to be flourishing dairies supplying pure good milk at a cheap rate to the poor. I am told however that even in a rich city like Ahmedabad there are cases of the wives of labourers feeding their babies on flour dissolved in water. There cannot be any sadder commentary on the way in which we protect the cow than that in a country which has such an extensive system of *pinjrapols* the poor should experience a famine of pure, good milk. That I hope will serve to explain to you how our failure to protect the cow at one end of the chain results in our skin and bone starvelings at the other.

Young India, 29-1-'25

MAN'S INHUMANITY

Not many people know what *phooka* is. Still fewer know that there is an association in Calcutta called the Anti-Phooka Association. Its patrons are Maharajadhiraja Sir Bijoy Chand Mahatab Bahadur and Justice Sir L. W. J. Costello. Its president is Shri Ramakumar Bangar. The office is at 65 Pathuriaghat Street. The Secretary thus describes the process of *phooka* :

"I have to inform you that the atrocities of *phooka* are perpetrated on each milch animal twice daily. The four legs of the animal are tied to four strong posts and two men hold the animal so tightly that she cannot make any movement of her limbs whatsoever. A bamboo rod or pipe, 22 inches long and 8 inches in circumference, is then forcibly pushed into the generative organ of the animal, and then one man begins to blow air into the uterus, causing it to be fully distended thereby. This inflammation causes extra pressure on the glands which helps the milk-man to extract the last drop of milk. The milching also is indescribably cruel and it is continued to the great pain of the animal till blood comes out of the udder. Sometimes a few drops of the blood get mixed up with the milk. Unable to make any movements, the animal silently bears this inhuman torture and her great pain is manifested only by the copious perspiration and tears that flow down her body and cheeks. This is repeated twice daily and the animal invariably swoons after each operation."

It is difficult to conceive anything more torturing or revolting than the process described by the Secretary. From the proceedings of the meeting of the Association it appears that the practice results in the sterility of the cows and she-buffaloes subjected to the torture. They are therefore transferred to butchers after they cease to yield milk even in spite of *phooka*.

The Association undertakes the prosecution of the torturers. It engages plain-clothes detectives to discover

the culprits. The activity of the Association is good as far as it goes. But it does not appear to me to go far enough. Punishment of a few criminals would not stop the inhumanity. It is necessary to carry on propaganda amongst the offenders and educate them to understand the evils of the system. Of course the surest way of dealing with the evil is for the Corporation to take charge of the whole of the milk supply of Calcutta and change the *gwalas* into its paid servants. They would then not be open to temptation as they are now. They will be under sanitary supervision. Milking will be done under proper control. The citizens will have a guarantee of having pure milk for their money. And there is not the slightest reason why the Milk Supply Department should not be self-supporting. The citizens will gladly pay an extra pie, if an increase in the selling price becomes necessary. Of course the milk supply has to become a monopoly of a municipality undertaking the enterprise, even as the postal stamp is the monopoly of the State.

Harijan, 19-6-'37

OUR CATTLE

[Addressing the Goseva Conference on February 1, 1942, Gandhiji said:]

“Today the cow is on the brink of extinction, and I am not sure that our efforts will ultimately succeed. But if she dies, we also die along with her — we, i.e. our civilization, I mean our essentially non-violent and rural civilization. We have, therefore, to make our choice. We can choose to be violent and kill all uneconomic cattle. Like Europe we should then breed our cattle for the purpose of milk and meat. But our civilization is fundamentally different. Our life is wrapped up in our animals. Most of our villagers live with their animals, often under the same roof. Both live together, both starve together. Often enough the owner starves the poor cattle, exploits them, ill-treats them, unmercifully extracts work out of them. But if we reform our ways, we can both be saved. Otherwise we sink together.”

Harijan, 15-2-'42

SECTION THREE: COW PROTECTION v. MUSLIMS

10

COW PROTECTION

I would not kill a human being for protecting a cow, as I will not kill a cow for saving a human life, be it ever so precious.

The cow question is a big question. The greatest for a Hindu. I yield to no one in my regard for the cow. Hindus do not fulfil their trust so long as they do not possess the ability to protect the cow. That ability can be derived either from body-force or soul-force. To attempt cow protection by violence is to reduce Hinduism to Satanism and to prostitute to a base end the grand significance of cow protection. As a Musalman friend writes, beef-eating which is merely permissible in Islam will become a duty, if compulsion is resorted to by Hindus. The latter can protect the cow only by developing the faculty for dying, for suffering. The only chance Hindus have, of saving the cow in India from the butcher's knife, is by trying to save Islam from the impending peril and trusting their Musalman countrymen to return nobility, i.e. voluntarily to protect the cow out of regard for their Hindu countrymen. The Hindus must scrupulously refrain from using any violence against the Musalmans. Suffering and trust are attributes of soul-force. I have heard that at big fairs if a Musalman is found in possession of cows or even goats, he is at times forcibly dispossessed. Those, who, claiming to be Hindus thus resort to violence, are enemies of the cow and of Hinduism. The best and the only way to save the cow is to save the Khilafat.* I hope therefore that every non-co-operator will strain himself to the utmost to prevent the

* i.e. to help Muslims to protect the Sultan of Turkey as the Caliph or head of Islam, and thus win their friendship. — Ed.

slightest tendency to violence in any shape or form, whether to protect the cow or any other animal or to effect any other purpose.

Young India, 18-5-'21

The Hindus reverence the cow as they reverence the Brahmana. But the case is not so outside India. So there is no prohibition in the religion of our Musalman brothers against the slaughter of cows. And if a Musalman brother slays a cow, for instance during Id, on what ground can a Hindu raise his hand to strike him? Is he enjoined by the Shastras to kill a fellow man in order to save a cow? There is really no such injunction in the Shastras; but on the contrary it is against the Shastras to do so. In order to save the cow you can only sacrifice your own life; you cannot take another's life, nor can you even cherish anger against him. My brother Maulana Mohammed Ali in one of his speeches today said one thing on this matter, which I realize as very true. He says that three-fourths of the responsibility for cow slaughter in India lies with the Hindus; and the Musalmans are guilty of only one-fourth. For the cows that are slain really come from Hindu custody. I have actually seen in Bombay ship-loads of cows being sent out from India for slaughter in other lands. It is the Hindus that do cow-selling business, and not the Musalmans.

Young India, 8-9-'21

BEFRIEND MUSALMANS

Though I regard cow protection as the central fact of Hinduism, central because it is common to classes as well as masses, I have never been able to understand the antipathy towards the Musalmans on that score. We say nothing about the slaughter that daily takes place on behalf of Englishmen. Our anger becomes red-hot when a Musalman slaughters a cow. All the riots that have taken place in the name of the cow have been an insane waste of effort. They have not saved a single cow, but they have on the contrary stiffened the backs of the Musalmans and resulted in more slaughter. I am satisfied that during 1921 more cows were saved through the voluntary and generous effort of the Musalmans than through Hindu effort during all the previous twenty years (say). The only effective and honourable way is to befriend the Musalmans and leave it to their honour to save the cow. Hindus commit no sin, if they cannot prevent cow slaughter at the hands of Musalmans; they do sin grievously when in order to save the cow, they quarrel with the Musalman.

Young India, 29-5-'24

Hindus must not imagine that they can force Musalmans to give up cow sacrifice. They must trust by befriending Musalmans, that the latter will, of their own accord, give up cow sacrifice out of regard for their Hindu neighbours.

Young India, 5-6-'24

CONVERT BY LOVE

[Extract from a speech at the Cow Protection Conference in Belgaum]

I have been telling Maulana Shaukat Ali all along that I was helping him to save his cow i.e. the Khilafat, because I hoped to save my cow thereby. I am prepared to place my life in the hands of the Musalmans, to live merely on their sufferance. Why? Simply that I might be able to protect the cow. I hope to achieve the end not by entering into a bargain with the Musalmans but by bringing about a change of heart in them. So long as this is not done I hold my soul in patience. For I have not a shadow of doubt in my mind that such a change of heart can be brought about only by our own correct conduct towards them and by our personal example.

Cow slaughter and man slaughter are in my opinion the two sides of the same coin. And the remedy for both is identical i.e. that we develop the *ahimsa* principle and endeavour to win over our opponents by love. The test of love is *tapasya* and *tapasya* means suffering. I offered to share with the Musalmans their suffering to the best of my capacity not merely because I wanted their co-operation for winning Swaraj but also because I had in mind the object of saving the cow. The Koran, so far as I have been able to understand it, declares it to be a sin to take the life of any living being without cause. I want to develop the capacity to convince the Musalmans that to kill the cow is practically to kill their fellow countrymen and friends—the Hindus. The Koran says that there can be no heaven for one who sheds the blood of an innocent neighbour. Therefore, I am anxious to establish the best neighbourly relations with the Musalmans. I scrupulously avoid doing anything that might hurt their feelings. I even try to respect

their prejudices. But I do this not in a spirit of bargain, I ask them for no reward. For that I look to God only. My Gita tells me that evil can never result from a good action. Therefore I must help the Musalmans from a pure sense of duty — without making any terms with them. Far more cows are killed today for the sake of Englishmen in India than for the Musalmans. I want to convert the former also. I would like to convince them that whilst they are in our midst their duty lies in getting rid of their Western culture to the extent that it comes in conflict with ours. You will thus see that even our self-interest requires us to observe *ahimsa*. By *ahimsa* we will be able to save the cow and also to win the friendship of the English. I want to purchase the friendship of all by sacrifice. What profit would it be if I succeed in saving a few cows from death by using force against persons who do not regard cow-killing as sinful? Cow protection then can only be secured by cultivating universal friendliness i.e. *ahimsa*.

Young India, 29-1-'25

13

HINDU RESPONSIBILITY FOR CATTLE DESTRUCTION

This is being written on Bakr-Id day — a day of rejoicing for the Musalmans and grief for Hindus. It is a day of grief for the Hindus because their Musalman brethren slaughter cows for sacrifices though they know that the cow is an object of worship and veneration for Hindus. Though I hold the cow as much in veneration as any Hindu and am responsible for bringing into being the (in my opinion) only scientific society for effectively protecting the cow, I have never sympathized with the Hindu grief and the implied anger against the Musalmans on Bakr-Id. The latter are undoubtedly foolish and obstinate in that

they slaughter the cow and needlessly wound Hindu susceptibility. For there is no religious obligation on the part of Musalmans to kill the cow on Bakr-Id or any other day. I have heard some Musalmans arguing that Hindus by their worship of the cow make it obligatory on them to kill the cow. This borders on compulsion. But if the Musalman is foolish and obstinate, the Hindu is criminally ignorant and indirectly becomes party to the slaughter of the cow by the Musalman. For cows are sold by Hindus as a rule. Hindu grief and anger are uncalled for. Hindu ignorance is responsible for many more deaths of cows than the deaths caused by the Musalmans' slaughter of the cow for one day in the year. Be it noted that Hindus are apparently quite reconciled to cow slaughter on days other than Bakr-Id.

I have in my possession startling authentic figures showing the annual slaughter of cattle and deaths from natural causes. According to the live stock census of 1935 about 80 per cent die naturally and 20 per cent are slaughtered. The percentage of natural death, however, varies according to locality. Where grazing conditions are good and cultivation careful, natural deaths fall as low as 7 per cent, and in famine zones they rise to 30 per cent. In the Bombay Presidency (British) it is estimated that there were, in 1935, 74.5 lakhs of cattle. Of these 9 lakhs died naturally against 2 lakhs by slaughter, i.e. 12 per cent against 3 per cent.

Now it is common knowledge that the cow is generally owned by Hindus. If they removed their unpardonable ignorance, they could easily prevent many deaths from natural causes.

Harijan, 27-2-'37

SECTION FOUR : LEGISLATION AGAINST COW SLAUGHTER

14

COW KILLING

[Extract from a speech at the Cow Protection Conference held at Belgaum]

Unfortunately today we seem to believe that the problem of cow protection consists merely in preventing non-Hindus, especially Musalmans, from beef-eating and cow-killing. That seems to me to be absurd. Let no one, however, conclude from this that I am indifferent when a non-Hindu kills a cow or that I can bear the practice of cow-killing. On the contrary, no one probably experiences a greater agony of the soul when a cow is killed. But what am I to do? Am I to fulfil my *dharma* myself or am I to get it fulfilled by proxy?

Musalmans claim that Islam permits them to kill the cow. To make a Musalman, therefore, to abstain from cow killing under compulsion would amount, in my opinion, to converting him to Hinduism by force. Even in India under Swarajya, in my opinion, it would be for a Hindu majority unwise and improper to coerce by legislation a Musalman minority into submission to statutory prohibition of cow slaughter. When I pledge myself to save the cow, I do not mean merely the Indian cow, but the cow all the world over. My religion teaches me that I should by my personal conduct instil into the minds of those who might hold different views, the conviction that cow killing is a sin and that therefore it ought to be abandoned. My ambition is no less than to see the principle of cow protection established throughout the world. But that requires that I should set my own house thoroughly in order first.

Young India, 29-1-25

STATES AND COW SLAUGHTER

I have received letters from Cow Protection Societies in Mysore, protesting against my letter to the Mysore Cow Protection Committee appointed by the State. My letter was in answer to a questionnaire issued by that Committee. Extracts from that letter published in the Madras Press led the Cow Protection Societies in question to think that I was totally against legal prohibition of cow slaughter under any circumstances whatsoever. I was surprised to receive these letters, and I wondered whether, in a moment of forgetfulness or inadvertence, I had ever said that there should never be any legislation against cow slaughter. I therefore asked for a copy of my letter from the Cow Protection Committee, which they have kindly sent me. I reproduce most of it below :

“In matters of religion I am against any State interference, and the cow question is in India a mixed matter of religion and economy. So far as economy is concerned I have no doubt that it is the concern of every State, whether Hindu or Musalman, to conserve the cattle supply. But, if I have understood your questionnaire rightly, the underlying note is whether the State would be justified in interposing itself between Hindus and Musalmans and regulate cow slaughter even for purposes which Musalmans considered to be religious. In India which I consider to be as much the land of Hindus born in it as of Musalmans, Christians and others born in it, even a Hindu State may not prohibit cow slaughter for purposes considered to be religious by any of its subjects, without the consent of the intelligent majority of such subjects, so long as such slaughter is conducted in private and without any intention of provoking or giving offence to Hindus. That the

very knowledge of any such slaughter would give offence to Hindus is inevitable. But unfortunately we know, that in India cow slaughter is often resorted to to defy and wound Hindu sentiment. This should be put down by every State that has the slightest regard for its subjects. But in my opinion the economic side of the cow question, if it is properly handled, automatically provides for the delicate religious side. Cow slaughter should be and can be made economically impossible, whereas unfortunately of all the places in the world it is the sacred animal of the Hindus which has become the cheapest for slaughter. To this end I suggest the following :

1. The State should in the open market buy out every cattle offered for sale by out-bidding every other buyer.

2. The State should run dairies in all principal towns ensuring a cheap supply of milk.

3. The State should run tanneries where the hides, bones, etc., of all dead cattle in its possession should be utilized, and should offer to buy again in the open market all private-owned dead cattle.

4. The State should keep model cattle-farms and instruct the people in the art of breeding and keeping cattle.

5. The State should make liberal provision for pasture land and import the best experts in the world for imparting a knowledge of the science of cattle to the people.

6. There should be a separate department created for the purpose, and no profit should be made in the department, so that the people may receive the full benefit of every improvement that might be made in the different breeds of cattle and other matters pertaining to them.

Date

28.2.2002

10/1/05

The foregoing scheme presupposes the State upkeep of all old, maimed and diseased cattle. This no doubt constitutes a heavy burden, but it is a burden which all States, but above all a Hindu State, should gladly bear. My own study of the question leads me to think, that the running of scientific dairies and tanneries would enable the State to cover the expenses of the upkeep of cattle, that have become economically useless, apart from the manure they yield, and to sell at market rates leather, leather goods; milk and milk products, besides manure and many other things that can be manufactured from dead cattle, and which today, owing to want of scientific knowledge or false sentiment, are practically going to waste, or from which the greatest advantage is not received. If you desire any further information on the scheme submitted, by way of elaboration of any parts of it, you will please let me know."

Neither the discussion with the members of the several Cow Protection Societies, nor the correspondence before me warrants any alteration of the opinion expressed in this letter. The reader will observe that I have nowhere said, that there should never be any legislation against cow slaughter. But what I have said is, that there should be no prohibition of cow slaughter by legislation *without the consent of the intelligent majority of the subjects* adversely affected by it. Therefore, the Mysore State will be perfectly justified, and, indeed, bound to undertake legislation prohibiting cow slaughter, if it has the consent of the intelligent majority of its Musalman population. The members of the Cow Protection Societies that met me assured me, that the relations between Hindus and Musalmans in Mysore were cordial, and that a majority of Musalmans in Mysore were as much in favour of legislative prohibition as Hindus, and I was glad to be assured by them, that many Europeans, especially missionaries, were in favour of such prohibition. So far, therefore, as the

question of legislation in Mysore is concerned, if the statements made to me are correct, the way is clear for legislative prohibition. But let me reiterate what I have pointed out in my letter, and what I have emphasized so often in these columns, namely, that legislative prohibition is the smallest part of any programme of cow protection. The trend of the letters received by me, and the activity of most Cow Protection Societies, however, show, that they would be satisfied with mere legal prohibition. I wish to warn all such societies against staking their all on legislation. We have already too much of it in this law-ridden country. People seem to think that when a law is passed against any evil, it will die without any further effort. There never was a grosser self-deception. Legislation is intended and is effective against an ignorant or a small evil-minded minority; but no legislation which is opposed by an intelligent and organized public opinion, or under cover of religion by a fanatical minority, can ever succeed. The more I study the question of cow protection, the stronger the conviction grows upon me, that protection of the cow and her progeny can be attained, only if there is continuous and sustained constructive effort along the lines suggested by me. There may be, probably there is, room for supplementing or amending the constructive programme sketched by me. But there is no room for doubting the absolute necessity of a vast constructive programme, if India's cattle are to be saved from destruction. And the preservation of cattle really means also a step towards the preservation of the starving millions of India's men and women, who have also been reduced to the condition of her cattle. The Indian States undoubtedly can, in this as in many such matters, give the lead to the rest of India. And among the States, probably, there is none better fitted, or better able, to make the right beginning than Mysore. It has, from all accounts received by me, a popular prince, an enlightened public opinion, no Hindu-Musalman ques-

tion, and a sympathetic Diwan. Mysore has also the Imperial Institute of Dairying and Animal Husbandry, and Mr William Smith, the Imperial Dairy Expert, is himself stationed at Bangalore. The State has, therefore, all the materials necessary for evolving a constructive policy. Add to this the fact, that Nature has endowed Mysore with a glorious climate. The title a Hindu king dearly cherishes is that of defender of the cow and the Brahmana. The cow means not merely the animal, the giver of milk and innumerable other things to India, but it means also the helpless, the downtrodden and the poor. Brahmana means the representative of divine knowledge and experience. But today, alas! Hindu princes are powerless, and in many cases even indifferent, if not unwilling, to ensure this full protection. Unless the States and the people co-operate with one another to control and regulate the breeding of cattle, the production of milk supply, and the disposal of dead cattle, for the benefit of the people as a whole, the cattle of India will be bred but to die an unnatural death at the hands of the butcher, notwithstanding all the legislation that may be passed against cow slaughter.

Young India, 7-7-'27

OUR RESPONSIBILITY FOR COW SLAUGHTER

[Extract from a speech at the Haripura Exhibition]

We have wasted our energies so far in saving the cow from the butcher's hands. Why should we try to wrest it from the butcher's hands? The butcher has to pursue his profession. To blame the butcher is like blaming the doctor for your fever. We have allowed it to go into the butcher's hands because of our gross neglect, and we are wholly responsible for its slaughter. It is for us to make it economically unnecessary and so impossible to sell the cow to the butcher.

Harijan, 19-2-'38

COW SLAUGHTER

Cow slaughter can never be stopped by law. Knowledge, education, and the spirit of kindness towards her alone, can put an end to it. It will not be possible to save those animals that are a burden on the land, or perhaps even man if he is a burden.

Harijan, 15-9-'46

In his post-prayer speech Gandhiji alluded to the number of wires which he was receiving, advising prohibition of cow slaughter. While he had always been a worshipper of the cow, he saw no reason why he should ask their Government to stop the slaughter of cows because it was contrary to Hindu religion. The tragedy was that the senders of the wires, and the Hindus as a whole, did not realize that while they did not actually slaughter cows themselves, they did equally badly by them. In the end

God was the Protector of the cow as He was of all. But the Hindus starved cows and cattle in general, they did not look after them as they should, they sold cows that were out of milk and never thought that they were sending them to the slaughter-house. They sold them to the best bidder. They were cruel to bullocks and tortured them with goads. It ill-befitted them to expect the law to observe their religion for them. Cattle wealth was largely in the hands of the Hindus but in no country was the breed so poor and so neglected. He remembered the magnificent specimen of the cattle in England where, while they certainly did eat beef, they bestowed the greatest care on their cattle wealth. Gandhiji implored them to turn their attention to the preservation of cows and cattle wealth. They could save them without recourse to law.

Harijan, 27-7-'47

In his post-prayer speech Gandhiji said that Rajendra Babu had told him that he had received about 50,000 post cards, 30,000 letters and thousands of telegrams asking for prohibition of cow slaughter in the Union of India. A telegram was received today saying that a *pandit* had undertaken a fast in Kanpur on that issue. Hindu religion prohibited cow slaughter for the Hindus, not for the world. Religious prohibition came from within. Any imposition from without meant compulsion. Such compulsion was repugnant to religion. India was the land not only of the Hindus but also of the Muslims, the Sikhs, the Parsis, the Christians, the Jews and all who claimed to be of India and were loyal to the Union. If they could prohibit cow slaughter in India on religious grounds, why could not the Pakistan Government prohibit, say, idol worship in Pakistan on similar grounds? He was not a temple-goer, but if he was prohibited from going to a temple in Pakistan he would make it a point to go there even at the risk of losing his head. Just as *Shariat* could not be imposed on

non-Muslims, Hindu Law could not be imposed on non-Hindus. He told the audience that many Hindus were guilty of cow slaughter by slow torture. It was the Hindus who expected cows outside India well knowing that they were to be slaughtered for beef extract which came to India and which the children of orthodox Hindus ate without compunction under medical advice. Were they not co-partners in cow slaughter ?

Harijan, 10-8-47

A large number of vocal Hindus have begun to believe the superstition that the Union belongs to the Hindus and that, therefore, they should enforce their belief by law even among non-Hindus. Hence an emotional wave is sweeping the country, in order to secure legislation prohibiting the slaughter of cows within the Union.

Let us at the outset realize that cow worship in the religious sense is largely confined to Gujarat, Marwad, the United Provinces and Bihar. Marwadis and Gujaratis being enterprising merchants, have succeeded in making the greatest noise without at the same time devoting their business talent to the solution of the very difficult question of conserving the cattle wealth of India.

It is obviously wrong legally to enforce one's religious practices on those who do not share that religion.

Harijan, 31-8-47

Gandhiji referred in his post-prayer speech to the proposal of stopping cow slaughter by means of legislation in the Indian Union. He said that he was of opinion that if they tried to do so through law, it would be a great mistake. He had been a devotee of the cow for over half a century. She had a permanent place in the economy of India. The cow can indeed be saved if they could steal into the hearts of the Muslims in such a way that they voluntarily undertook the responsibility out of deference to

the feelings of their Hindu friends. This had been abundantly demonstrated during the Khilafat days. Now that India was free, the same old relation could be restored if they behaved towards one another correctly.

Hinduism, he said, would be wrongly served if compelling legislation was resorted to in such matters. Hinduism could only be saved by doing unadulterated justice to man to whatever religion he might belong.

Harijan, 31-8-'47

SECTION FIVE : HOW WE MAY SERVE THE COW

18

HOW TO SAVE THE COW ?

Cow protection societies must turn their attention to the feeding of cattle, prevention of cruelty, preservation of the fast disappearing pasture land, improving the breed of cattle, buying from poor shepherds and turning *pinjrapols* into model self-supporting dairies.

Young India, 29-5-'24

19

HOW TO SAVE OUR SURPLUS CATTLE ?

Mr Andrews has sent me the following cutting for disposal :

"What other country on earth pays such a staggering price for the veneration of an animal?" asks the June issue of *The Round Table*, the Quarterly Review of the Politics of the British Commonwealth. Figures are supplied by the article entitled, 'The Disabilities of Rural India', showing that the annual economic loss 'is greater than the total revenue of British India',—an economic waste which is 'almost unbelievable'. The article referred to points out that 'the regard, even veneration, which some of the people have for all forms of animal life prevents them from restricting its multiplication, even when it comes into direct economic competition with man for the produce of the soil, or makes it impossible for him to develop it to its full capacity', and the following are the figures representing India's 'staggering price' for cow veneration:

What surplus oxen cost India	..	Rs. 1,15,20,00,000
What surplus cows cost India	..	Rs. 61,20,00,000
Total	..	Rs. 1,76,40,00,000

"This amount calculated at Rs 15 to the £ equals £ 117,600,000. The annual land revenue for British India we are told, amounts to 36 crores of rupees, so that the annual economic loss due to surplus cattle is over four times the land revenue."

29

There is no doubt that, like the growing poverty of India, the cattle problem is growing more and more serious. But the cattle problem of India is, for the vast majority of the population — the Hindus, the problem of cow protection taking the expression in its broad sense. There is, therefore, no doubt that we shall have to pay 'a staggering price' for ever. If we have no 'cow veneration', we could make short work of all the surplus and dilapidated cattle, and save the seventeen hundred and sixty four millions of rupees which the writer has dished out for us. Similarly, no doubt, we could free this land from poverty by killing out all the surplus population, all the diseased, all the weaklings, and a few thousands of us may then live on this vast surface of the earth, with a few pistols or some more quickly working weapon of destruction for ridding ourselves of those men and animals ferocious or otherwise, whom we may regard as a burden. But in India, like the poor and the diseased everywhere we shall have to have our brethren the cattle also, and we must, therefore, solve the cattle problem as the poverty problem along our own, or as some might say, superstitious lines. I have endeavoured to show the way in my address to the Cow Protection Conference. Within the limitations prescribed by religious sentiment, we must adopt the latest scientific methods. We must resort to scientific castration, we must find out an economical method of feeding our cattle, we must take the maximum of service consistently with the welfare of the cattle, we must increase the milk supply from the existing cows and buffaloes, and we must make the best economical use of the hide of all dead cattle. If we succeed in doing these things, we shall have gone a long way towards solving the cattle problem.

There will still have to be a price paid for religious sentiment, but a religious sentiment is not worth the name if it is not worth paying for. The money that is daily being paid in the name of cow protection blindly and in utter

ignorance of scientific facts, can be well utilized for the purposes above mentioned. It will make no direct return, but it will, under better conditions, prevent the wicked waste that is going on, and certainly save thousands of cattle from the butcher's knife to which they fall victim, not because of Musalman or English cursedness, but because of Hindu stupidity. Today, because of our ignorance and slothfulness millions of human beings and millions of cattle are dying of semi-starvation — a sad reflection upon religious India.

Young India, 27-8-'25

20

HOW TO SAVE UNECONOMIC COWS ?

How can the cow be saved without having to kill her off when she ceases to give the economic quantity of milk or when she becomes otherwise an uneconomic burden ? The answer to the question can be summed up as follows :

1. By the Hindus performing their duty towards the cow and her progeny. If they did so, our cattle would be the pride of India and the world. The contrary is the case today.

2. By learning the science of cattle breeding. Today there is perfect anarchy in this work.

3. By replacing the present cruel method of castration by the humane method practised in the West.

4. By thorough reform of the *pinjrapols* of India which are today, as a rule, managed ignorantly and without any plan by men who do not know their work.

5. When these primary things are done, it will be found that the Muslims will, of their own accord, recognize

the necessity, if only for the sake of their Hindu brethren, of not slaughtering cattle for beef or otherwise.

The reader will observe that behind the foregoing requirements lies one thing and that is *ahimsa*, otherwise known as universal compassion. If that supreme thing is realized, everything else becomes easy. Where there is *ahimsa*, there is infinite patience, inner calm, discrimination, self-sacrifice and true knowledge. Cow protection is not an easy thing. Much money is wasted in its name. Nevertheless, in the absence of *ahimsa* the Hindus have become destroyers instead of saviours of the cow. It is even more difficult than the removal of foreign rule from India.

[Note : The average quantity of milk that the cow in India yields is said to be roughly 2 lbs. per day, that of New Zealand 14 lbs., of England 15 lbs., of Holland 20 lbs. The index figure for health goes up in proportion to the increase in the yield of milk.]

Harijan, 31-8-'47

TANNERIES AND DAIRIES

[In presenting for approval the draft constitution of the All-India Cow Protection Association Gandhiji made the following remarks:—Ed.]

Two things I want to invite your attention to as important in the constitution, viz. the establishment of tanneries and dairies. That is too practical, too earthly you will say. But religion which takes no count of practical affairs and does not help to solve them, is no religion. That is what the life of the ascetic King Janaka teaches us. And that is why I am putting a religious matter before you in a practical form.

We shall have to take control of the milk supply, and also of the disposal of dead cattle. You are perhaps shocked as I speak of hides and tanneries. But do you know that because we would not take charge of them the 'untouchable' who does the work today excuses himself for eating carrion and remaining unclean. Let us show him the proper way of doing things and he will reform his ways. I am suggesting all these things with the fullest consciousness of the meaning of all that I say. I may tell you that it was I who vowed never more to take cow's or buffalo's milk when I learnt for the first time in South Africa the cruel way in which the last drop of milk was drawn out of them. I know that there are beef-eaters amongst Vaishnavas, I know that there are Vaishnavas who do not hesitate to take Liebig's Extract of Beef on the pretext that it is prescribed by the doctor. Should we then hesitate to control tanneries in a religious spirit? I tell you we have come to this stage because we would not take care of dis-

abled and dead cattle and because we exported them to America.

Let us therefore establish tanneries and attend to the proper disposal of dead cattle. Let us establish dairies and ensure a cheaper and better supply of milk. I will not hesitate to seek co-operation of the Government in this matter, for I know they have got the services of good dairy experts. If we do these two things then alone is it possible to stop the avoidable slaughter of thousands of cattle annually.

Young India, 7-5-'25

22

AN IDEAL DAIRY

An ideal *goshala* would supply the city of its domicile with cheap and wholesome milk from cattle of its own keeping and cheap and lasting foot-wear not out of slaughtered hide but out of the hide of dead cattle. Such a *goshala* will not be on one or two acres of ground in the heart of a city or in its immediate neighbourhood but it would have at some distance, but within easy reach, fifty to a hundred acres of ground where a modern dairy and a modern tannery would be conducted on strictly business but national lines. Thus there would be no profits and no dividends to be paid and there would be also no loss incurred. In the long run such institutions dotted all over India would be a triumph of Hinduism and would be proof of Hindu earnestness about cow, that is, cattle protection and it would provide decent employment for thousands of men including educated men ; for both dairy and tannery work require expert scientific knowledge. Not Denmark but India should be a model State for the finest dairy experiments, and India should not to her shame have to export nine crore rupees worth of dead cattle hide annually and for her consumption use slaughtered cattle hide. If such a

state of things is a shame for India it is a greater shame for Hindus. I wish that all the Goshala Committees will take to heart the remarks I made in reply to the Giridih address and make their *goshalas* into ideal dairies and tanneries and a refuge for all worn out and maimed cattle.

Young India, 22-10-'25

23

A SCHEME FOR TANNERIES AND DAIRIES

In private talks with friends I have often asked them to interest themselves in and help the movement on its constructive side. In response to their desire I publish the scheme I have discussed with some.

1. In order to test the efficacy of tanneries as part of a programme of cow protection it is necessary to own one and to utilize it not for profit, but purely for cow protection. For this purpose a sum of Rs. 1,25,000 is required to be invested in one of the existing tanneries. The information in my possession shows that the majority of existing tanneries buy and cure the hide of slaughtered cattle, and that India exports the bulk of the hide of dead cattle. These conditions of things can only be remedied by lovers of the cow controlling tanneries and preventing by their philanthropy leather becoming an article of trade competition.

2. Preliminary research must be carried out for exploring the possibilities not of remunerative dairy farming, but of conducting dairies on a vast scale, if without profit, also without loss in the long run. For this preliminary work a sum of ten thousand rupees at least must be spent inside of twelve months in engaging services of dairy experts and finding out suitable places for accommodating tens of thousands of cattle. Without

acquiring such control, the terrible toll we pay in the slaughter of cattle, which are simply through ill-use or ignorance rendered profitless and therefore sold for slaughter by the *goalas* in the several cities of India, must continue. Nothing can save the cattle from the butcher's knife if they become uneconomic.

3. Scholarships must be found for preparing students for tannery and dairy work. For this a sum of Rs 5,000 for one year is necessary.

4. A sum of Rs 3,000 is required for books on cattle breeding, dairy farming, tannery etc.

Thus a sum of Rs 1,28,000 is required for capital expenditure and Rs 15,000 for research, exploration and preparation. I omit the current expenditure, which must be found from the normal income from membership of the All-India Cow Protection Association. It must be dissolved if it cannot pay its way.

Young India, 5-11-'25

CONDITIONS OF COW PROTECTION

Recently at Ghatkopar, Bombay, I had the occasion to visit the institution of the Humanitarian Society ably managed by its Secretary Shri Nagindas. I ventured at that time to lay down the conditions of cow protection which are well-worth repeating :

1. Every such institution should be situated out in the open where it is possible to have plenty, i.e. thousands of acres, of open ground capable of growing fodder and giving exercise to the cattle. If I had the management of all the *goshalas*, I should sell the majority of the present ones at handsome profits and buy suitable plots in the vicinity except where the existing places may be needed for mere receiving depots.

2. Every *goshala* should be turned into a model dairy and a model tannery. Every single head of dead cattle should be retained and scientifically treated and the hide, bones, entrails etc. should be used to the best advantage. I should regard the hide of dead cattle to be sacred and usable as distinguished from the hide and other parts of slaughtered cattle, which should be deemed to be unfit for human use or at least for Hindu use.

3. Urine and dung in many *goshalas* are thrown away. This I regard as criminal waste.

4. All *goshalas* should be managed under scientific supervision and guidance.

5. Properly managed, every *goshala* should be and can be made self-supporting, donations being used for its extension. The idea is never to make these institutions profit-making concerns, all profits being utilized towards

buying maimed and disabled cattle, and buying in the open market all cattle destined for the slaughter-house.

6. This consummation is impossible if the *goshalas* take in buffaloes, goats, etc. So far as I can see, much as I would like it to be otherwise, not until the whole of India becomes vegetarian, can goats and sheep be saved from the butcher's knife. Buffaloes can be saved if we will not insist upon buffalo's milk and religiously avoid it in preference to cow's milk.

To save the cow and her progeny — and that only is a feasible proposition — the Hindus will forgo profits from the trade concerning the cow and her products, but never otherwise. Religion to be true must satisfy what may be termed humanitarian economics, i.e. where the income and the expenditure balance each other. The attainment of such economics is just possible with the cow, and the cow only, with the assistance of donations for some years from pious Hindus. It should be remembered that this great humanitarian attempt is being made in the face of a beef-eating world. Not till the whole world turns predominantly vegetarian is it possible to make any advance upon the limitations I have sought to describe. To succeed to that extent is to open the way, for future generations, to further effort. To overstep the limitation is to consign the cow for ever to the slaughter-house in addition to the buffalo and the other animals.

Hindus and the humanitarian societies in charge of *goshalas* and *pinjrapols*, if they are wisely religious, will bear the foregoing conditions of cow protection in mind and proceed immediately to give effect to them.

Young India, 31-3-'27

TANNING AND DAIRYING IN CITIES

It is a painful fact that in our present condition we have to cultivate the science of tanning in the cities and then take it to the villages. For one thing it is impossible to conduct big experiments in the villages, and cattle that are slaughtered in the cities come from the villages. If we can therefore conduct experiments in dairying and tanning from the religious and national point of view in the cities, we can easily give the benefit of them to the villages, and the cattle wealth of India which is at the present day being destroyed because of our ignorance will be saved, and man and animal will both be less unhappy than now.

Young India, 19-5-'27

COW PROTECTION AND TANNERIES

I have before me a Press cutting containing a long interrogatory addressed to me on the question of cow protection. The underlying suggestion obviously seems to be that the methods of cow protection advocated by me are not consistent with my profession of Hinduism. For in his introductory remarks to his questions the writer has tried to make light of the basic principle of cow protection that I have formulated viz., that what is economically wrong cannot be religiously correct. In other words, if a religion cuts at the very fundamentals of economics it is not a true religion but only a delusion. My critic on the other hand believes that this view is opposed to the teachings of our ancient scriptures. I, at least, am not aware of a single text

in opposition to this view, nor do I know of any religious institution that is being maintained in any part of the world today in antagonism to the elementary principles of economics. As for nature, any one who has eyes can see that it always observes the principle that I have stated. For if it has implanted in its creation the instinct for food it also produces enough food to satisfy that instinct from day to day. But it does not produce a jot more. That is nature's way. But man, blinded by his selfish greed, grabs and consumes more than his requirements in defiance of nature's principle, in defiance of the elementary and immutable moralities of non-stealing and non-possession of other's property, and thus brings down no end of misery upon himself and his fellow creatures. To turn to another illustration, our Shastras have enjoined that the Brahmana should give knowledge as charity without expecting any material reward for it for himself. But they have at the same time conferred upon him the privilege of asking for and receiving alms and have laid upon the other sections of the community the duty of giving alms, thus uniting religion and economics in a common bond of harmony. The reader will be able to find further instances of this kind for himself. The religious principle requires that the debit and credit sides of one's balance-sheet should be perfectly square. That is also the truest economics and therefore true religion. Whenever there is any discrepancy between these two it spells bad economics and makes for unrighteousness. That is why the illustrious author of the Gita has defined *yoga* as "balance" or "evenness". But the majority of mankind do not understand this use of economics to subserve religion; they want it only for amassing "profits" for themselves. Humanitarian economics, on the other hand, for which I stand rules out "profits" altogether. But it rules out 'deficit' no less for the simple reason that it is utterly impossible to safeguard a religious institution by following a policy of dead loss.

That is the reason why in spite of our 1,500 *goshalas* we have not only failed to protect the cow but its slaughter is day by day on the increase. If in spite of this we delude ourselves into the belief that we have done our duty by the cow by establishing these homes for cattle, and remain snugly self-satisfied there, whatever comfort it may give us, it would not bring us one whit nearer the goal of cow protection, whereas it can be demonstrably shown that by adopting the policy that I have suggested we can easily realize this goal. It does not require much effort to see that but for the fact that the cow yields us milk, the duty of cow protection would not have come into being at all. There are a host of other innocent animals besides the cow in the world but nobody has ever thought of setting up their protection as a religious obligation, and if somebody had attempted it, it would have simply remained a dead letter. We have use for the cow. That is why it has become religiously incumbent on us to protect it.

To turn now to the questionnaire drawn up by my critic, I will embody the questions in my answers without reproducing them separately.

1. Every *goshala* or *pinjrapol* should have a tannery adequate to its needs attached to it. In other words, the manager in charge of every such institution should have a thorough knowledge of the immediate steps necessary for utilizing the remains of dead cattle. If this is done, the question, viz. how many heads of cattle should a particular *goshala* contain, would not arise at all.

2. I do not know what the rate of mortality of cattle in *goshalas* is nor is it relevant to my proposition. So long as there is a single head of cattle in a *goshala* its manager ought to know how to dispose of its remains after it is dead, just as he is expected to know how to look after it while it is alive.

3. Such humanitarian institutions for the protection of cattle as I have described should normally take charge of the remains of the cattle that might die in the village. Therein lies the interest of the cattle, the depressed classes and the general public alike. In villages where there are no *goshalas* or the concomitant tanneries, some local person who believes in cow protection should take it upon himself to get the carcasses removed to the nearest tannery or get the preliminary processes performed upon it and send the useful parts there.

4. The establishment of such tanneries as I have described does not require much capital outlay. Only some initial expenditure would be needed to train up workers for this work.

5. It is true that at present the leather prepared from slaughtered hides is superior in quality to that prepared from dead hides. But during the late war the Government of India spent enormous sums of money to improve the quality of leather from dead hides ; and tannery experts have told me that dead hides can be tanned into as good leather as leather from slaughtered hides. I myself am conducting experiments in this direction. In Cuttack, Shri Madhusudan Das has been doing the same for a number of years and with success as he tells me. The Calcutta Government Research Tannery is also at present engaged in similar experiments.

But the tragedy of it today is that we annually export crores worth of hides to foreign countries, and by ignorantly using leather goods made from the hides of slaughtered cattle, become indirectly participators in the sin of their slaughter.

It rests in our hands entirely to prevent the export of hides of our dead cattle to foreign countries. And this we can easily do by bringing the export trade in hides under

our control through the establishment of tanneries on altruistic lines. We cannot only save nine crores of rupees annually to our country but by employing that sum properly save a countless number of cattle.

I need hardly say that the humanitarian tanneries that I have suggested would also be utilizing the bones and other useful parts of the dead cattle. In fact it is more necessary than ever.

Young India, 3-11-'27

27

PINJRAPOLS

Discussing the question of *pinjrapols* Gandhiji said at the Go-seva Sangh Conference on February 1, 1942 :

“ Unless we realize and define their proper functions, they are sure to remain the economic waste they are. Their proper function is to take care of dry, old and disabled cows, of which individual owners cannot possibly take care — certainly not in towns and cities. Their function is not that of a dairy — though they may run a separate dairy if they can — but the care of the old and the disabled animals, and to provide the raw material for a tannery. There should be a well-equipped tannery attached to every *pinjrapol*. They should maintain the best stud bulls and loan them out for public use, they should provide every facility for the humane and scientific castration of bulls to be turned into bullocks, and there should be instruction centres for the agriculturist and the dairy farmer. Here is plenty of scope for our agricultural and dairy graduates who should receive additional training for the special work and then be attached to every one of our *pinjrapols*. All the *pinjrapols* should then be affiliated to our Association

which should be the central institution for expert advice, collection and co-ordination of information and statistics, and so on."

Harijan, 8-2-'42

28

INDIVIDUAL OR COLLECTIVE ?

The most important question for consideration before the recent Go-seva Sangh Conference was whether cow farming should be in the hands of individuals or done collectively. I myself had no hesitation in saying that she could never be saved by individual farming. Her salvation, and with her that of the buffalo could only be brought about by collective endeavour. It is quite impossible for an individual farmer to look after the welfare of his cattle in his own home in a proper and scientific manner. Amongst other causes, lack of collective effort has been a principal cause of the deterioration of the cow and hence of cattle in general.

The world today is moving towards the ideal of collective or co-operative effort in every department of life. Much in this line has been and is being accomplished. It has come into our country also, but in such a distorted form that our poor have not been able to reap its benefits. *Pari passu* with the increase in our population land holdings of the average farmer are daily decreasing. Moreover what the individual possesses is often fragmentary. For such farmers to keep cattle in their homes is a suicidal policy ; and yet this is their condition today. Those who give the first place to economics and pay scant attention to religious, ethical or humanitarian considerations proclaim from the house-tops that the farmer is being devoured by his cattle due to the cost of their feed which is out

of all proportion to what they yield. They say it is folly not to slaughter wholesale all useless animals.

What then should be done by humanitarians is the question. The answer obviously is to find a way whereby we may not only save the lives of our cattle but also see that they do not become a burden. I am sure that co-operative effort can help us in a large measure.

The following comparison may be helpful :

1. Under the collective system no farmer can keep cattle in his house as he does today. They foul the air, and dirty the surroundings. There is neither intelligence nor humanitarianism in living with animals. Man was not meant to do so. The space taken up by the cattle today would be spared to the farmer and his family, if the collective system were adopted.

2. As the number of cattle increases, life becomes impossible for the farmer in his home. Hence he is obliged to sell the calves and kill the male buffaloes or else turn them out to starve and die. This inhumanity would be averted, if the care of cattle were undertaken on a co-operative basis.

3. Collective cattle farming would ensure the supply of veterinary treatment to animals when they are ill. No ordinary farmer can afford this on his own.

4. Similarly one selected bull can be easily kept for the need of several cows under the collective system. This is impossible otherwise except for charity.

5. Common grazing ground or land for exercising the animals will be easily available under the co-operative system, whereas today generally there is nothing of the kind for individual farmers.

6. The expense on fodder will be comparatively far less under the collective system.

7. The sale of milk at good prices will be greatly facilitated, and there will be no need or temptation for the farmer to adulterate it as he does as an individual.

8. It is impossible to carry out tests of the fitness of every head of cattle individually, but this could easily be done for the cattle of a whole village and would thus make it easier to improve the breed.

9. The foregoing advantages should be sufficient argument in favour of co-operative cattle farming. The strongest argument in its favour is that the individualistic system has been the means of making our own condition as well as that of our cattle pitiable. We can only save ourselves and them by making this essential change.

I firmly believe too that we shall not derive the full benefits of agriculture until we take to co-operative farming. Does it not stand to reason that it is far better for a hundred families in a village to cultivate their lands collectively and divide the income therefrom than to divide the land anyhow into a hundred portions? And what applies to land applies equally to cattle.

It is quite another matter that it may be difficult to convert people to adopt this way of life straightaway. The straight and narrow road is always hard to traverse. Every step in the programme of cow service is strewn with thorny problems. But only by surmounting difficulties can we hope to make the path easier. My purpose for the time being is to show the great superiority of collective cattle farming over the individual effort. I hold further that the latter is wrong and the former only is right. In reality even the individual can only safeguard his independence through co-operation. In cattle farming the individual effort has led to selfishness and inhumanity, whereas the collective effort can abate both the evils, if it does not remove them altogether.

Q. Please explain more fully why individual care of the cow is violent and collective effort non-violent.

A. The present pitiable condition of cattle is surely enough proof. The cow today is a burden simply because individual ownership and care have failed. In a previous article I have explained how the individual cannot take proper care of his cattle, how he cannot keep a bull or grazing ground for himself, and how difficult it is for him to make proper arrangements for the sale of milk and ghee. It would be quite impossible for individuals in any country to make their own arrangements for sending their letters with the ease that the postal department does for crores of people, rich and poor alike. The same applies to cows. If at all the problem can be solved, it will be through collective ownership or use. Ownership and service go ill together. I may belong to one person, but thousands can serve me. If one person alone were to claim the right to serve me, where would I be ? This is exactly what is happening to the cow. Individuals own the cow, they do not serve it.

Harijan, 8-3-'42

DAIRIES

In his post-prayer speech Gandhiji remarked that those who were responsible for the management of *goshalas* knew how to finance them, but they were too ignorant to know the science of dealing with the cattle wealth of India. They did not know how to bring up the cow so as to increase her milk yield and improve the stock of bulls that she gave. Therefore *goshalas* throughout India, instead of being institutions where one could learn the art of properly breeding up the cattle of India and being model dairies and places where one could buy good milk, good cows, equally good breeding bulls and strong oxen, were merely places where cattle were kept somehow. The result was that instead of being the premier country in the world for exhibiting splendid cattle and where abundant pure milk could be had at the cheapest rate possible, it probably occupied the lowest rank in the matter. They did not even know how to make the best use of cattle dung and urine, nor did they know how to make use of dead cattle, with the result that through their ignorance they lost crores of rupees. Some experts contended that the cattle wealth was a burden on the land, fit only to be destroyed. He did not share the opinion, but if the general ignorance prevailed for any length of time he would not be surprised to find that cattle had become a burden on the land.

Harijan, 30-11-'47

DRY COWS FOR PLOUGHING

[From a speech at the Cow Protection Conference at Belgaum]

At Lahore I met Lala Dhanpatrai, somewhat of a crank like myself. He said it was Hindus who sold cows to the Musalman butcher. The reason for this practice, he told me, was economical. The village commons that served as grazing grounds for the cattle had been enclosed by the Government and so people could not afford to keep cows. He suggested a way out of the difficulty. It was no longer necessary, he told me, to sell cows that had ceased to give milk. He himself, he said, had tried the experiment of buying such cows. He then put them to the plough. After some time if proper care was taken, they put on flesh and became fit to bear again. I cannot vouch for the truth of this statement. But I see no reason why this practice should not be generally adopted if the facts are as stated by Lala Dhanpatrai. Our Shastras certainly have nowhere said that under no circumstances should the cow be used for draught purposes. If we feed the cow properly, tend it carefully and then use her for drawing carts or working the plough, always taking care not to tax her beyond her capacity, there can be nothing wrong in it. I therefore commend the suggestion for consideration and adoption if it is found to be workable. We may not look down upon a person if he tries to protect the cow in this manner.

Young India, 29-1-'25

BARREN COWS

Q. Why may not work such as ploughing or grinding corn be taken from barren cows? Would that not be one way of preventing their going to the slaughter-house?

A. This question used to be much discussed at one time owing to the enthusiasm of the Punjabi who used to advocate the use even of milch cows for draft purposes. He used to claim that they would yield more and richer milk for the exercise given to them. Anyway my devotion to the cow does not preclude me from taking such labour as she can perform without the slightest detriment to her body. The fact is that our treatment of draft animals leaves much to be desired. I would welcome the use of barren cows for gentle labour, if only it would make people more considerate than they are towards the other animals.

Harijan, 10-5-'42

COWS FOR PLOUGHING

Q. With the exception of those cows or buffaloes that are in calf, cannot all others, whether in milk or not, be used to plough the land? This would be of immense help to the farmer but the general public is averse to the idea. What is your opinion?

A. This question was put to me as long ago as 1915. I felt then as now, that if the cows referred to, were used for purposes of ploughing the land, it would not hurt them. On the contrary, it would make them strong and increase their yield of milk. But this benefit could only come about, provided the cow was treated as a friend and not cruelly, as cattle in our land so often are. This friendly treatment should of course be insisted on for animals from whom we take service. Every living being has to work within his or its limitations. Such work uplifts, never lowers either man or beast.

Harijan, 15-9-'46

SECTION SIX : BUFFALO v. COW

33

BUFFALO BREEDING TO BE GIVEN UP

Physicians unanimously declare that cow's milk is medically superior to buffalo's milk, and it is the opinion of dairy experts that cow's milk can by judicious management be made much richer than it is at present found to be. I hold that it is impossible to save both the buffalo and the cow. The cow can be saved only if buffalo breeding is given up. The buffalo cannot be used for agricultural purposes on a wide scale. It is just possible to save the existing stock, if we will cease to breed it any further. It is no part of religion to breed buffaloes or for that matter cows. We breed for our own uses. It is cruelty to the cow as well as to the buffalo to breed the latter. Humanitarians should know that Hindu shepherds even at the present moment mercilessly kill young male buffaloes as they cannot profitably feed them.

Young India, 31-3-27

34

COW v. BUFFALO ? OR COW *cum* BUFFALO ?

A worker in the cause of cow protection writes from Konkan :

"In your recent article giving the conditions of cow protection you said that the question of the protection of the cow should not be mixed up with that of the protection of the buffalo. At the back of this suggestion seems to be the fact that the buffalo bull is not useful for agricultural purposes. But in Konkan he is fairly useful. It is the buffalo bull which draws the municipal refuse carts, which works water-pumps, and even draws the plough, especially when there is a heavy downpour disabling the bullock, and most of the agriculture in Konkan is being done under monsoon conditions. The buffalo has therefore his place in Konkan.

52

"The Konkan cow does not yield more than one pound of milk, whereas the buffalo yields 5 to 10 lbs. It may be possible, after systematic breeding, to make the cow yield more and richer milk, but the buffalo needs no special culture at all. Does not therefore the buffalo in Konkan at any rate need as much protection as the cow ? Please correct me if I am wrong.

"The buffalo, I admit, has no place on the *ghats* where the temperature is higher, fields are bigger and water scarce. He needs much water both to drink and bathe in. Konkan is the place for him."

My article was not intended to throw the buffalo by the board, it suggested the stopping of buffalo-breeding in her own interest. In other words it meant freedom of the buffalo from its bondage. We have domesticated the cow for our own use and therefore it has become part of our religion to protect her. It was my object to show that in trying to breed the buffalo, as we do the cow, we might lose both.

The Konkan example does not affect my proposition. We must, of course, make use of the existing stock of buffaloes, and let it be done in parts like Konkan. But our duty is clear. We must not increase our responsibility by breeding the buffalo where we can do with the cow alone. We must therefore content ourselves with the use of cow's milk only. It should not be necessary in a city like Bombay to use buffalo's milk in preference to cow's milk. An endeavour should be organized on a large scale to cheapen the supply of pure cow's milk, and to improve the milk yield of the cow. It is possible too to make cow's milk richer. All these things have been developed into a science in Europe, especially in Denmark. Cows in those countries yield richer and more milk than our buffaloes. I have heard from Vaidyas that buffalo's milk lacks and can never be made to have the hygienic and health-giving properties that cow's milk possesses. Pious people have told me, that cow's milk is *sattvik* (possessing finer qualities) whereas buffalo's milk is *tamasik* (gross). I do not know how far

this is true. I am trying to ascertain the truth through the proper channel. But it does seem to me, that all that the buffalo can give and even more, the cow also can or can be made to give. If this is true, why should man, having regard to his own needs, make himself responsible for breeding the buffalo? And having regard to the need of the buffalo, why should we needlessly keep her in bondage? Or to put it more simply, why should we press her into our service?

The fact that some people make a pecuniary gain out of buffalo breeding can have no place in this religious discussion in which we have in view the good of all. In thinking solely of the narrow interest of the self or of the moment, we have ruined ourselves, i.e. our country and our religion. We can be a nation, only when we try to think in terms of the wider interests of the country. If we cannot even think in those terms, it is no use talking of religion. From the national point of view, the good of the country is the supreme consideration. From the religious point of view the good of all living beings from the cow down to the ant is the supreme consideration.

Let the reader now turn to the table given on the following page. The table relates to the income from and expenditure on the cattle maintained at the Satyagrahashram. The names are those of different cows. The manager in his covering letter says :

"It is by no means the rule that the buffalo yields more than the cow. Some of the cows in the table yield a net profit, some just pay their way and some are boarders. These last we shall prevent from breeding and propose to take light work from them. A sterile cow has already been trained to do some work. The buffalo calves sell cheap, whereas some calves of the cow are worth Rs 100 each. Two or three have taken the place of the horse with the result that we have dispensed with our horse-carriage."

The Ashram has decided to have no more buffaloes. We may not draw large deductions from the table, but it

is certainly obvious that if the cow is fed properly she compares favourably with the buffalo in her yield, she does not cost more, and her calves are much more useful.

The Satyagrahashram Dairy

(Figures for the month of Maha)

Name of cow or buffalo	Total Milk Produced Seers	Daily Average Seers	Total Food Cost R. a.p.	Establish- ment Charges R. a.p.	Total Expense R. a.p.	Price of milk R. a.p.
Savitri	331.25	11.375	20-10-6	12-9-6	33-4-0	41-5-6
Gomati	261.50	9	16-1-6	12-9-6	21-3-0	32-10-0
Nanda	188	6.5	16-1-6	12-9-6	28-3-0	23-4-0
Sarayu	313.50	10.594	20-9-6	12-9-6	33-4-0	39-3-0
Nani Tapi	208.25	7.19	16-1-6	12-9-6	29-3-0	26-8-0
Kashi	288.75	9.969	16-1-6	12-9-6	29-3-0	35-9-6
Godavari	287.50	9.938	22-13-6	12-9-6	35-7-0	25-11-0
Narmada	232.50	8	16-1-6	12-9-6	29-3-0	29-1-0
Moti Tapi	378.75	13.063	20-10-6	12-9-6	33-4-0	47-5-6
Jamani	106	3.657	18-1-6	12-9-6	30-13-0	13-4-0
Sabarmati	205.25	7.078	18-1-6	12-9-6	30-13-0	25-10-6
Chandrabhaga	15	5	4-1-0		4-1-0	1-14-0
Khandi			13-5-6		12-5-6	
Black Buffalo	296.50	10.219	22-10-6	12-9-6	35-0-0	41-9-0
Heifer of ..	278	9.578	22-10-6	12-9-6	35-4-0	39-10-0
Grey Buffalo	234.78	8.078	22-10-6	12-9-6	35-4-0	33-0-0
Heifer of ..	380.50	13.125	22-10-6	12-9-6	35-4-0	53-8-0
Goats	218.75	7.547	4-0-0			13-13-6
				Rs. * 188-14-6	494-14-0	541-14-9
					** 25-2-0	
				Rs.	520-0-0	

Young India, 19-5-'27

* With fifteen big milch cattle and a few goats the figure for establishment charges would appear rather big. But as in a joint family the burden falls solely on the earning members, the expenses of about eighty cattle in the dairy are evenly divided amongst the milch ones only. It is through an error that the goats seem to have been exempted from their share of the establishment charges.

** This item indicates the loss incurred through unsold milk subsequently churned.

COW'S MILK v. BUFFALO'S

The question whether cow's milk is superior to buffalo's has come up for inquiry in considering that of village-reconstruction. I have addressed friends on the subject. Shri Haribhau Phatak has forwarded to me a letter received by him from Prof. Rao Bahadur Sahasrabuddhe, which reads as follows :

"With regard to your enquiry about the differences between cow milk and buffalo milk, I have to say that the fat and caséin of cow milk are more easily digestible than those of buffalo milk. The cow milk has also greater amount of vitamins than buffalo milk. These qualities affect children and adults equally, but an adult can digest buffalo milk while a child cannot. I think this is all that you want."

He has also received an opinion from Dr. S. K. Apte of Sholapur, Vice-President, Gopalak Sangh, which is reproduced below, the names of those who sent replies to his questionnaire and some of the replies themselves being omitted.

"The question whether cow milk is superior to buffalo milk is being discussed during the last three years and this has had a good effect in attracting the public attention to the utility of cow milk. In India, from older writings and age-long belief, it is conceded that cow milk is superior to buffalo milk. The same conclusion can be drawn from the fact that in other countries only cow's milk is used. But in this age of science, no theory is taken as accepted until it is proved by demonstrations. It will not do merely to say that cow milk is superior to buffalo milk because our ancestors did, and other countries do, use cow milk. The burden of proving that it is superior lies on those who assert so. There are several ways of proving this scientifically. They can be enumerated as follows :

1. To compare the merits and demerits of both milks by analysis of their components. It is possible chemically to

ascertain the nutritive value of their components. Such an experiment has been made by Prof. Rao Bahadur D. L. Sahasrabuddhe of the Agricultural College, Poona, the details of which he has published in the *Dnyanaprakash* dated 11-9-1934. He has made it clear therein not only that cow milk is very useful for the nutrition of young children but that buffalo milk is actually harmful to them. Prof. Sahasrabuddhe says:

'The buffalo milk is rich in fat, which children cannot digest. On account of indigestion they suffer from diarrhoea. The acids in the undigested fat draw up salts from the body which are necessary for the building of bones and the lack of which is responsible for rickets. The fats in cow milk and buffalo milk differ from each other in other digestive properties. The percentage of volatile and soluble acids is greater in cow ghee, and consequently it is more easily digested.'

The experiment which Prof. Sahasrabuddhe has made also proves that the casein in cow milk is digested in the stomach more easily than that in the buffalo milk. His whole essay is informative and instructive.

2. To make two equal groups of boys or men living under the same conditions and to provide one batch with about a seer of cow milk and the other with an equal amount of the buffalo milk for a certain period and to watch and record the physical, mental and intellectual development of each member of both the groups. This is the second way of ascertaining which milk is superior to the other. No such experiment is made in Europe or America as there are no buffaloes there. The Gopalak Sangh of Sholapur had written to the *Hoard's Dairyman* for information as to which countries except India use buffaloes as dairy animals. The reply to this query shows that buffalo milk is used outside India only in the Phillippine Islands and the southern part of China. As for the Phillippine Islands, however, the residents there prefer cow milk to buffalo milk as they are convinced of the utility and importance of the former (vide *Gorakshana*, Poona, of 28-4-'34). An experiment of the above nature is, therefore, not likely to be made anywhere outside India. This experiment will have to be made on some students residing in a Boarding House. This being an expensive task, the Gopalak Sangh, Sholapur, had requested other cow protection societies and philanthropic rich men to finance the Sangh for a comparative study of this nature,

but it is regrettable that none of them came forward. If sufficient pecuniary help had been obtained, the experiment could easily have been carried on in the Dr. Chati Anath Vidyarthi Graha, Sholapur, by selecting two groups of boys in that Boarding and providing each group with a sufficient quantity of either milk and marking the results. I earnestly request every institution and individual to see if any one can make such an experiment and to publish the result thereof.

3. This comparative experiment on human beings is a matter of great expense. It is possible to try this experiment on animals, especially rats and guinea-pigs kept in experimental laboratories. As the Gopalak Sangh has no material available for this sort of experiment, it has written to the Government Pasteur Institute at Coonoor to try such an experiment; but no reply has yet been received from the authorities there.

4. The Gopalak Sangh, Sholapur, took recourse to a fourth and the easiest way towards this end. A questionnaire regarding cow and buffalo milks was prepared and sent some six months back to various doctors, physicians, research experts, newspapers and periodicals, and Government Officers in Medical and Health Departments in and outside India. About seven hundred copies in Marathi and English of this questionnaire were then sent out. Many newspapers and periodicals in India and *Hoard's Dairyman* in America published it and asked for the views of their readers thereon. Of the replies we received, only two came from outside India—one from America and the other from the Government Medical Department in Ceylon. About fifty replies have been received so far.

The following are the conclusions deducible from the replies:

1. Buffalo milk is injurious to the development of children, and only cow milk is, in the absence of mother's milk, useful to them.

2. Cow milk, being easily digestible, is more beneficial to patients than buffalo milk.

3. There is no definite evidence to show that the use of buffalo milk by adults is in any way injurious. Mr Bruen, the livestock expert to the Government of Bombay, says that buffalo milk is hard to digest by a person of any age, because the excess fat in buffalo milk when it forms in soap in the intestine, is hard to digest with the usual amount of salts and it takes the deficient quantity of the mineral salts from bones, which are consequently weakened. This does not occur in the digestion of cow milk.

4. Cow milk is useful for intellectual growth, mainly of children. No definite conclusion can be drawn regarding better effect of cow milk on the intellectual growth of adults.

5. If, instead of rearing up buffaloes, cows are kept in the city, it will produce a beneficial effect on the general hygiene of that city with less expense."

The experiment that Dr. Apte has suggested is worth making. The question of the comparative merits of the cow and the buffalo is of national importance from many points of view. In no other country in the world do these animals play the part that they do in the life of the nation in India.

Even without further experiment, the opinions collected by Dr. Apte of eminent medical men and dairy experts sufficiently prove the superiority of cow's milk over buffalo's.

Harijan, 22-2-'35

36

BUFFALO v. COW

Those who are engaged in saving the cow from swift destruction that awaits her if measures are not taken betimes to save her, are often confronted with the question whether even apart from the religious sentiment the buffalo is not the cheaper animal to keep. As a layman I have always hazarded the opinion that the cow is the cheaper to keep, at any rate in the long run, that it is impossible to save the two animals, and that if we would but concentrate attention on saving the cow, the buffalo will take care of herself. But if the cow goes, the buffalo will never be able to take the cow's place and the struggling starving farmer will have in the deprivation of the cow and her male progeny a handicap that will leave him

prostrate. Those who are interested in this important problem will get some help from the following opinion of Sardar Datar Singh, M.D.D. (Eng.) of the Montgomery Dairy Farm sent to me by a friend :

"The buffalo is not an economical animal for the following reasons :

(1) A buffalo matures on the average one year later than a good Indian milch bred cow.

(2) The dry period, i.e. the time when she goes dry and up to the time she calves, is more than thrice that of a cow.

(3) A good cow will give more milk than a buffalo.

(4) The male calves of the buffaloes are practically quite useless for agricultural purposes, and if sold fetch very little price and therefore they are generally slaughtered, while the male calves of a cow are used all over India for agricultural purposes and are equally useful as female calves and fetch a good price.

(5) A buffalo is more susceptible to diseases than a cow.

(6) A buffalo requires more looking after and is only happy when there is a large grazing area with plenty of water which is not in the reach of a small zamindar.

(7) A buffalo feels the heat and cold much more which results in the deterioration of the milk yield, but it is not the case with a cow.

(8) The only point in favour of keeping a buffalo is that she gives a much higher percentage of fat than a cow, but if all the details of the production are taken into account a good cow beats a buffalo even in that."

Harijan, 24-10-'36

THE COW AND THE BUFFALO

During his days at Tithal Gandhiji had a number of talks with the workers and visitors about cow protection. A Jain ascetic felt very much puzzled when Gandhiji asked him if he knew the number of cows in the Bombay Presidency, the statistics of their mortality and the conditions in which they were maintained. "The fact is," Gandhiji said, "we would protect the cow, but we have never studied the ways and means of doing it. In trying to save the cow and the buffalo, we are saving neither." To the workers he has set a difficult problem by asking them to have nothing but cow's milk and cow's ghee for the delegates and visitors to the next Congress. The plan is to have a number of cows from now, make ghee and sell it until the moment when we can start storing it up for use at the Congress, and give the people object-lessons in cow keeping. It is a stupendous task, but it has to be faced, if we want to start a new era in cow protection.

"The pity is," he said on another occasion, "that most of our cow protection associations will keep cows and buffaloes both, and try to run them and make them paying concerns by selling buffalo's milk. The cow, they think, is uneconomic, not knowing that if the cow was exclusively taken care of and all attention concentrated on increasing her yield of milk, on making her a good breeder, and on making use of every bit of her carcass after she is dead, she would be more than an economic proposition. If someone could convince me that both the cow and the buffalo could be protected, without our having to feed on them or slaughtering them, I should be only too willing to include both in my scheme. The fact, however, is that the buffalo, apart from her milk, is an uneconomical animal.

Except in a few wet regions of India the buffalo is useless for agricultural purposes and so we either starve or kill the male progeny. Some of the best known dairies priding themselves on the wonderful milk-yield of their cows have been found to be doing away with the male calves. We have to make them good milkers and good mothers of fine plough-bullocks. It is no use saying that there is no demand for cow's milk. If we refused to supply any other milk, and if we ensured a supply of the richest and purest and safest milk, everyone would enlist himself as our regular customer. But the first thing is to eliminate the buffalo. It is like the exclusive emphasis on Khadi. You cannot promote Khadi by dividing your attention between Khadi and mill cloth. But we have not given the necessary attention to her feed and her upkeep. Show the best results and I tell you you will not have to complain of lack of patronage. Why is there such a mad run on a certain company's shares? Because people know that it is going to be a highly paying concern. If you could make people believe that yours also would be a paying concern, they would rush to offer their patronage to you. Concentrate on one. Take a city like Bombay, take a census of the children, enlist the names of people who will buy only cow's milk for their children, and make your dairy an exclusive cow's milk supplier for children. Don't you know how they popularize an article like tea? They distribute free packets of tea, they run free tea-houses. You can do likewise and popularize cow's milk. Your ambition should be to cater to the needs of the whole of Bombay. There is a demand for cow's milk in a city like Calcutta. The best Haryana breed are imported to Calcutta but as soon as the cows go dry they go to the butcher. The result is that Haryana cow is getting scarce in the Punjab. No, the cow need not go to the butcher at all. She will have more than paid for her upkeep for her dry years by her rich yield of milk and progeny, and after death, she would

fetch the same value as she did when alive. The cow can either be protected by the State or by those who are really religiously inclined. The State we may leave aside for the moment, it is the religiously inclined who should rise to the occasion and bring to bear knowledge and industry to the task."

Harijan, 19-6-'37

[At the Goseva Sangh Conference of 1-2-'42, Gandhiji observed:]

"Unless we protect the cow today, we will fail to save both the cow and the buffalo. And it is not possible to make a combined endeavour to save both. The combined endeavour will result in the buffalo devouring the cow. The cow is the more neglected animal, and that is why we should concentrate on the cow.

"There is no question of 'boycott', much less of the killing of the buffaloes. Slaughter is a thing that suggests itself easily to Western economists. That is why they cut the Gordian knot by slaughtering the inferior breed of cows and bulls. But that solution is no good for me. It is my firm conviction that, if we master the real science of saving the cow, the science of saving the buffalo and other animals would automatically be revealed to us."

Harijan, 15-2-'42

SECTION SEVEN : GHEE

38

COW'S GHEE v. BUFFALO'S GHEE

Opinion about the two varieties of ghee is not as decisive as about the two milks. This much, however, is clear, that chemical analysis shows no superiority of buffalo ghee over cow ghee. It is impossible to support both the animals. We have, therefore, to make the choice. The balance of opinion, all things considered, lies with the cow which, with proper care and selective breeding, is capable of giving as rich and sweet milk as anyone can desire.

Harijan, 22-3-'35

39

ADULTERATION OF GHEE

Very few people realize that conservation of cattle wealth of India is a major economic problem beset with many complexities. Adulteration of ghee has always been one of them. During the last few years it has become a growing menace, owing to the import of cheap vegetable oil miscalled ghee because of its having been congealed and otherwise processed so as to look like ghee. Shri Pannalal says that middlemen and sellers of dairy products profusely adulterate real ghee and thus undersell the farmer or cattlekeeper. He says that it is impossible for farmers to hold out against this competition if the mischief continues for any length of time, especially as such

vegetable 'ghee' is being manufactured in Bombay and elsewhere on a large scale. Shri Pannalal rightly adds that agriculture without dairying and cattle breeding for draft purposes will be an impossibility if real ghee disappears from the market. Cattle-keeping will then become a luxury instead of a paying occupation. Shri Pannalal, therefore, suggests that drastic measures should be taken to prevent adulteration. I heartily endorse the suggestion. There should be a well regulated public agitation against adulteration, and preventive legislation should be passed if necessary.

Harijan, 20-1-'40

40

THE PROBLEM OF GHEE

Speaking at the All-India 'Goseva Sangh Conference held on February 1, 1942, Gandhiji said : " The whole milk and ghee trade is in the hands of the Hindus. But have we been able to ensure a supply of pure milk and ghee ? The milk is adulterated, and even the water used for adulteration is not clean. The ghee sold in the market can often be described as poison rather than ghee. The butter we get from New Zealand, Australia or Denmark is guaranteed pure cow's butter, but there is no guarantee about the butter or ghee available here. There is not a shop in Wardha, where some of us are keen on this problem, where one could go and buy a seer of cow's ghee of guaranteed purity."

Harijan, 8-2-'42

COW AND BUFFALO GHEE

At the Goseva Sangh Conference held on February 1, 1942, Gandhiji remarked: "I am amazed at our partiality for buffalo milk and ghee. Our economics is short-sighted. We look at the immediate gain, but we do not realize that in the last analysis the cow is the more valuable animal. Cow's butter (and ghee) has a naturally yellowish colour which indicates its superiority to buffalo butter (and ghee) in carotene. It has a flavour all its own. Foreign visitors who come to Sevagram go into raptures over the pure cow's milk they get there. Buffalo milk and butter are almost unknown in Europe. It is only in India that one finds a prejudice in favour of buffalo milk and ghee. This has spelt all but extinction of the cow, and that is why I say that, unless we put an exclusive emphasis on the cow, she cannot be saved."

Harijan, 8-2-'42

SECTION EIGHT: MISCELLANEOUS

42

FAECES AS CATTLE FOOD

I have seen in childhood in Porbandar cows freely eating human faeces. The practice appeared to me to be revolting and the feeling has persisted to this day. But a correspondent wrote telling me that in Satara District it was the usual thing for *gwalis* to pay for the right of getting access to the *pekhanas* of people so that their cattle may eat the faeces from day to day. The correspondent said that the feeding of cows with faeces increased the yield of milk. Having no reason to doubt my correspondent's veracity I asked a medical friend to obtain an expert's opinion on the statement. Here is the startling opinion :

"Normal faeces contain some nutritive material in the form of cellulose and nitrogenous material. The main substance in the faeces which might produce some physiological action on the animal feeding on them is vitamin B. 'That vitamin B is present in the faeces was shown by Cooper (1914). He cured polyneuritic pigeons by administering an alcoholic extract of faeces. There seems to be general agreement that the nursing animal requires an increased amount of vitamin B in order to suckle her young successfully.' (Vide Monograph on Vitamins published by Pickett Thomson Research Laboratory, London).

"It is quite possible that animals feeding on faeces get a liberal supply of this vitamin which ensures a copious secretion of milk from the active mammary gland.

"Lack of appetite and deficient utilization of food are well marked characteristics of vitamin B deficiency in the diet, and it is quite likely that cows that feed on faeces along with other vegetable foodstuffs will put on fat owing to stimulation of

appetite by vitamin B and greater utilization of carbohydrate food which is mostly transformed into fat in herbivorous animals.

"As regards the bacteria, etc. which are normally to be found in the stools of human beings, it may be said that most of them are dead or dying bacteria and that the few that survive are killed by the gastric juice in the cow's stomach."

Thus though the chemical evidence in favour of human excreta as good food for cattle may be said to be established, the psychological objection will persist.

Harijan, 22-6-'35

43

MARCH OF CIVILIZATION

Q. On page 91 of *Harijan* dated 14-4-'46, it has been argued that the bullock is a living machine and that contact with such harmless animals is a potent factor in the onward march of human civilization. The animals are, however, made 'harmless' by making them 'impotent'. Is this the correct method of the onward march of civilization? If we have cows, we must have bulls. The bullock is a creation of human selfishness and cruelty. If not in thinking man, in the lower animals at any rate, all the force of their nature rages in the fury of the generative desire. Therefore, to turn the noble animal, the 'Vahana of Mahadev' into a beast of burden is sad.

A. The writer is logical. But such logic would prevent the domestication of the cow. For there is probably more cruelty in domesticating the cow than in castrating the bull. It is a question of degree. Further march of civilization seems to imply increasing domination of man over beast, together with a growingly humane method of using them.

There are three schools of humanitarians. One believes in replacing animal power by the use of any other. Another believes in treating animals as fellow beings and making such use of them as a brotherly spirit will permit. The third will not make use of lower animals for man's selfish purpose but will employ instead one's own power and that of fellow beings to the extent that the latter give intelligent and willing use. I belong to the third school. It is possible by human labour, judiciously and humanely employed, to do fruit culture to a large extent and even corn culture. Indeed, as prisoners we civil resisters in Transvaal dug up stony ground for converting it into a municipal garden. No ploughing would have answered the purpose. The ground could yield only to the pickaxe.

The first I hold to be useless and even injurious in the end to mankind. A judicious combination of the other two seems to me to be the goal. I can see no escape from castration. The only thing to be done is to make it progressively humane.

A correspondent has brought forward in this connection the question of branding animals. Does the pain caused by branding compensate for the benefit it confers upon the owner and the animal? If it confers none on the animal, naturally branding must be taboo.

Harijan, 5-5-'46

BOOK ON THE COW *

The most authentic and perhaps exhaustive literature up to date on the cow and the buffalo was to be found, Gandhiji said, in the monumental work of Shri Satish Chandra Das Gupta of the Khadi Pratishthan. It was not filled with extracts from extant literature but it was based on personal experience and written during one of his imprisonments. It was translated in Bengali and Hindustani. Those who studied the book would find it of great service in promoting the wellbeing of India's cattle and in the endeavour to increase the yield of milk. There was in the book also a comparison between the cow and the buffalo.

Harijan, 30-11-'47

* *The Cow in India*, Vols. I and II, by Satish Chandra Das Gupta, Khadi Pratishthan, Sodepur, Calcutta, pp. 2030 ; Rs. 16.

SECTION NINE : ASSOCIATION FOR SERVICE OF THE COW

45

GOSEVA SANGH

The name suggested in the published draft for the much smaller body that was to take the place of the All-India Association was 'Cow Protection Society'. The eagle eye of Shri Jamnalalji detected the incongruity in the name. He rightly argued that the very small body of persons mostly unknown to fame could not arrogate to themselves the function of protecting the cow, they could only and in all humility endeavour to serve the cow to the best of their ability. He therefore suggested the proper title Goseva Sangh, literally Cow Service Society. This was acclaimed by those present as the better title.

The reader may know that the majority of the members of the new Society are inmates of the Ashram and then too only those who are either actually conducting the dairy and the tannery experiment or are specially interested in it. The rest are those who whole-heartedly believe in this class of constructive work as the only real means of saving the cow from inevitable destruction. It will be the duty of these workers to try to interest the shepherds and the *govals* in the science of cattle preservation. If this numerous body of men and women could be induced to take a more intelligent and humanitarian view of their occupation than which there can be nothing more honourable, half the battle is won. There is at present a close race for life being run between the cow and man in India. And if the cow is not scientifically bred and profitably used,

she must eat us or be eaten by us. Whilst therefore the ambitious title and the equally ambitious constitution are withdrawn the work survives only to be done in an intenser form.

Although it was proper for the old Association to be disbanded it may be claimed that its existence was not altogether purposeless. It was instrumental in putting before the public valuable literature on the subject in a popular cheap and handy form. Above all it succeeded in removing to a large extent the Hindu prejudice against tanneries. Whereas four years ago every one laughed at the idea of tanneries being any part of a scheme of cow protection, now everybody recognizes at least in theory their tremendous importance in cow preservation. Again, four years ago no one worth mentioning thought of constructive work in connection with cow protection. The all pervading idea was that the cow could be saved if the Musalman could be induced not to slaughter her for Bakr Id. Now almost every one recognizes that without the constructive work of the kind mapped out by the defunct Association the cow cannot be saved.

But before it is taken up in practice by the public at large, an ocular demonstration of the feasibility of the constructive method has to be given. That is the work inherited by the Goseva Sangh from the parent body.

Young India, 2-8-28

GOSEVA SANGH

(Cow Service Association)

[The following is a translation of the constitution adopted by the Standing Committee of Goseva Sangh that met on 28th and 29th ultimo at the Udyoga Mandir, Sabarmati. I hope the reader will not be disturbed over what may appear to him to be a novelty in constitution making in which members have no rights and strange duties are expected of them. The members of the Standing Committee have come to the conclusion that the very difficult work of serving the cow is not possible without a large number of men and women devoting themselves to it in a spirit purely of service combined with full desire and preparedness for learning the science of cow preservation ; nor need the reader be surprised over the alternative subscriptions in the shape of donating unslaughtered hide or self-spun-yarn. It is any day easier to pay five rupees yearly than to find two hides of naturally dead cattle. The very act of procuring such hide by one's own effort and not through deputy involves a certain amount of trouble and the gaining of some knowledge about hides. This is a definite gain. And if the reader will but remember that the word cow is to be taken in the widest sense and includes all life that serves mankind and demands protection, the connection of self-spun yarn with the Goseva Sangh will become immediately obvious.

M. K. G.]

The Cow Protection Conference held at Belgaum on 28th December, 1924 resolved to found a permanent body called The All-India Cow Protection Association, and appointed a committee to frame a constitution for it. The Committee met in Delhi on 26th and 28th January, 1925, and the constitution drafted by it was adopted with some amendments at a public meeting held in Madhavbag,

Bombay on 28th April, 1925. This All-India Cow Protection Association, having not been able to command such public attention and sympathy as to entitle it to be called an All-India organization, its members met at the Satyagraha Ashram, Sabarmati, on 25th July, 1928, disbanded it and adopted the following resolution :

“Inasmuch as the All-India Cow Protection Association has not been able to command public attention and sympathy commensurate with the all-India character it has claimed, and inasmuch as its activities have been confined to the slow spread of the objects of the Association and especially to helping to conduct a dairy and tannery at the Satyagraha Ashram in terms of the objects of the Association, and inasmuch as the subscriptions and donations are mainly confined to friends who are interested in the experiment, and inasmuch as the numerous *goshalas* and *pinjrapols* which were expected to respond to and be affiliated to the Association have nearly entirely failed to do so, the existing members of the Association resolve to disband it, and not retaining the existence of the Association in any shape or form, to adopt the less pretentious title of Goseva Sangh (Cow Service Society) and irrevocably to entrust the affairs, management and control of the funds and stock of the Association to the following permanent Standing Committee of Management of the Society (for names of the members see below), with full powers to disburse the funds, conduct the said experiments, to add to their number, to fill up vacancies caused by the resignation or the death of a member, to expel a member by a majority vote and otherwise carry out the objects of the expiring Association and to frame a constitution and rules for the management of the Society and to make such amendments thereof as may from time to time be required.”

In pursuance of this resolution the Standing Committee of the Cow Service Association hereby adopts the following constitution for it :

The object of the Cow Service Association and the means by which it shall carry on its work are identical with the objects and the means of the late "All-India Cow Protection Association," which are as follows :

Objects

Whereas the Hindus have failed in cow protection which is an obligation imposed on them by their religion, and whereas the cows in India and their progeny are deteriorating day by day :

The All-India Cow Protection Sabha is formed for the proper fulfilment of the religious obligation of cow protection.

The object of the Sabha shall be to protect the cow and her progeny by all moral means.

"Cow protection" shall mean the protection of the cow and her progeny from cruelty and slaughter.

Note : It will be against the fundamental policy of the Sabha to bring physical force or pressure to bear on those communities whose religion does not prohibit, or regards as obligatory, cow slaughter.

Means

The Sabha shall carry on its work by the following means :

1. By pleading with those who may be ill-treating cows, bullocks, etc., and by carrying on propaganda against such ill-treatment by means of leaflets, lectures etc. ;
2. By taking charge of diseased and disabled cows and oxen from their owners wherever the latter cannot afford to maintain them ;
3. By superintending and inspecting the administration of existing *pinjrapols* and cow protection institutions, and by helping in their better organization and management, as also by establishing fresh institutions ;

4. By breeding model cows and draught cattle by means of cattle farms etc., and by providing clean and cheap milk through properly kept dairies ;

5. By opening tanneries for tanning hides of dead cattle and thereby stopping or reducing the export abroad of disabled cattle ;

6. By enlisting men of character and education in the cause, and founding scholarships etc., for training them in the work ;

7. By holding an inquiry into the causes of the disappearance of grazing lands and into the advantages or disadvantages thereof.

8. By investigating into the necessity or otherwise of the practice of castrating bulls, and if found necessary and useful, investigating into the possibilities of discovering a harmless method of castration or a wholesome modification in the present method ;

9. By collecting funds ; and

10. By taking whatever other steps as may be necessary for the work of cow protection.

Membership

Any person of the age of eighteen years or above, who subscribes to the object of the Association, and

1. Who pays to the Association an annual subscription of five rupees ; or

2. Who sends to the Association 12,000 yards of even and well twisted self-spun yarn ; or

3. Who sends to the Association every year two cow or bull hides whether raw or tanned, shall be a member of the Association.

Any person who pays to the Association in advance a consolidated amount of Rs 500 shall be a life member of the Association.

Duties of Members

This Association has been conceived as a body of

servants, who have not so much rights as duties, or to whom duties should be as rights. The following therefore shall be the duties of members :

1. They shall, as far as may be, use only cow's milk whenever they have an occasion to use milk or milk products.

2. Whenever they have to use leather articles for personal use they shall use only the hides of dead cattle and never use the hides of slaughtered cows or bullocks. With regard to other things made of leather, they shall also, as far as may be, use only dead cattle hide.

3. If members keep cattle for milk, they shall keep cows only and not buffaloes. They will reason with buffalo keepers to replace buffaloes with cows.

4. They will carry the message of the Association to *pinjrapols*, *goshalas* and similar humanitarian organizations.

5. In case they follow cow keeping as a profitable occupation, they will devote all profits beyond their maintenance to the cause of cow protection so long as cow protection in India has not been placed on a satisfactory footing.

6. They will induce moneyed men to take up dairying and tanning for humanity's sake.

7. They will try to acquire the knowledge requisite for carrying on dairying or tanning, and will, wherever possible, seek to maintain themselves through the service of the cow.

Sympathizers

Any person who, while approving of the duties laid on members, is unable to discharge them fully but is anxious to acquire the ability to shoulder them, may be a sympathizer of the Association, provided that he fulfils the conditions of membership in other ways.

Administration

The entire administration of the Association shall vest in the Standing Committee consisting of the following members :

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (President)

Revashankar Jagjivan Jhaveri (Treasurer)

Jamnallal Bajaj

Vaijanath Kadia

Manilal Vallabhji Kothari

Mahavirprasad Poddar

Shivlal Mulchand Shah

Parameshvariprasad Gupta

Dattatreya Balkrishna Kalelkar

Vinoba Bhave

Chhaganlal Khushalchand Gandhi

Chhaganlal Nathubhai Joshi

Narayandas Khushalchand Gandhi

Surendranath Jayasval

Chimanlal Narasinhadas Shah

Pannalal Balabhai Jhaveri

Yashvant Mahadev Parnerkar

Valji Govindji Desai (Secretary)

with full powers to disburse the funds, to conduct dairying and tanning experiments and otherwise carry out the objects of the Association, to add to their number, to fill up vacancies caused by the resignation or death of a member or otherwise, to remove a member by a majority vote on proper and sufficient grounds, to frame a constitution and rules for the management of the Association and to make such amendment thereof as may be required from time to time.

Only members of the Association shall be eligible for appointment to and continuance on the Standing Committee.

Five members shall form the quorum for a meeting of the Committee.

In case of emergency the President shall have the power of taking necessary action without waiting for calling a meeting of the Committee, and also when there is no quorum at a meeting actually called. The President however shall immediately inform the members of action thus taken.

Whenever it is difficult or unnecessary to convene a meeting of the Committee, the Secretary shall have the power to circulate a resolution among members and obtain their votes by correspondence. Such resolution shall be considered as duly agreed to if none of the members objects. If a member does not reply within a fortnight he will be held to have waived his right to object.

The books of the Association shall be open to public inspection and shall be audited by competent auditors every year. A statement of accounts shall be published every six months.

The treasurer shall be responsible for the accounts of all the receipts and disbursements, all amounts exceeding one thousand rupees to be kept deposited in a bank of his approval.

All communications relating to the Association should be addressed to the undersigned.

Udyoga Mandir,
Sabarmati

Valji Govindji Desai
Secretary
Cow Service Association

Young India, 6-6-'29

GOSEVA SANGH RESOLUTIONS

[Passed at the Conference recently held at Wardha]

1. Whereas India is primarily an agricultural country, 80 per cent of its people being dependent on agriculture, and whereas Indian agriculture depends on bullocks, and whereas the cow is not only the milk-and-ghee-giver but also the sole means of providing bullocks, this Conference is definitely of opinion that the improvement of the present condition and economic status of the cow and her progeny is more important than that of other cattle and indispensable in any scheme of economic planning on a national basis.

2. Whereas to underfeed animals, to keep them in an insanitary condition, to overload them, to take more work from them than they can give, to beat them, to torture them with spikes, and the cruel *phooka* is wholly against humanitarian principles, and whereas such practices decrease the utility of the animals, this Conference appeals to the general public and in a special way to the members of the Goseva Sangh and other cow-lovers to arouse the public conscience and make the utmost effort to put a stop to such inhuman treatment and where necessary to seek the assistance of the law.

3. Whereas the real object of *pinjrapols* and charitable *goshalas* is to give asylum to diseased, old and disabled cattle and save them from pain and slaughter, this Conference is of opinion that in order effectively to achieve the object the following reforms in their management and programme of work are essential :

(a) Every institution should provide proper maintenance and veterinary and other scientific facilities for cattle. These facilities should also be made available to the neighbouring public.

(b) It should be the duty of the institution to see to it that scrub animals are not allowed to procreate. It should be incumbent on the management to arrange for proper feeding and care of the well-bred cows as also for improvement in the breed of cattle with a view to producing cows who will yield more milk and bullocks capable of doing more work.

(c) Every institution should keep good bulls whose services should be available to the general public also.

(d) Every institution should, as far as possible, make provision for spacious dry cattle farms where the dry cows and calves of the neighbouring public may be kept at concession rates. Good bulls should also be kept.

(e) Every institution should make arrangements for producing green grass and fodder in ample measure and for preserving the same by means of silage etc.

(f) The buildings of *pinjrapols* should be constructed so as to ensure cleanliness and healthy living. Wells, water troughs, etc. should be scientifically planned on a uniform model.

(g) There should be an expert in animal husbandry in charge of each institution. He should have thorough knowledge of cattle farming, fodder cultivation and veterinary science.

4. Whereas it is desirable that all those institutions which accept the Conference resolution regarding *pinjrapols* should be conducted on uniform lines and efficiently managed, the Conference recommends to them to obtain certificates from and affiliate themselves with the Goseva Sangh.

The Conference recommends to the Goseva Sangh to frame the necessary rules in order to facilitate certification and affiliation of institutions, and to invite existing *pinjrapols* and *goshalas* to get themselves affiliated to the Sangh.

Harijan, 22-2-'42

GOSEVA

The name *Goseva* (cow service) was chosen after careful thought. The sense of patronage contained in *Goraksha* (cow protection) was eliminated by the substitution of the word *Seva*. The Hindu believes in the cow as mother and indeed she is so.

Preservation of cattle is a vital part of *Goseva*. It is a vital question for India. It is a tragedy that the country which worships the cow pays scant attention to her and her progeny.

Speeches are not going to solve the problem. There is urgent need for deep study and the spirit of sacrifice. To amass money and dole out charity does not connote real business capacity. To know how to preserve cattle, to impart this knowledge to the millions, to live up to the ideal oneself and to spend money on this endeavour is real business. Today the opposite obtains. The rich amass wealth somehow and salve their consciences by giving a paltry sum out of it towards the upkeep of *goshalas* by untrained persons and fancy that they have acquired merit. Perhaps even greater capacity is needed to solve this immensely difficult problem than to obtain Swaraj.

Harijan, 17-2-'46

HOW TO SERVE THE COW

PART TWO — BY OTHERS

COW PROTECTION IN HINDUISM

(By P.)

The question of cow protection is extremely complex. The fanatic, the humanitarian and the economist will of course view it differently according to their respective perspectives. But the Hindu ideal of cow protection has nothing in common with that of the first and transcends that of the other two. To take a concrete instance, the camel and the horse occupy the same position in the economic life of the people of Arabia that the cow does in ours and not even his worst enemy will charge the Arab with ingratitude towards his friends — the horse and the camel. Yet the ideal of camel protection or horse protection never arose in Arabia. Again a people that imprinted the image of the ox on their coins could not be unaware of the value of the ox in agriculture, still the ox was never accorded a place in the pantheon of the ancient Greeks. Coming to our times, even in the West the cow has more and more come to be regarded as the 'mother of prosperity' and dairying has been developed into an elaborate science, but Westerners have not adopted the ideal of cow protection in the sense in which we have. The cow protection ideal set up by Hinduism is essentially different from and transcends the dairy ideal of the West. The latter is based on economic values, the former while duly recognizing the economic aspect of the case, lays stress on the spiritual aspect viz. the idea of penance and self-sacrifice for the relief of martyred innocence which it embodies. Under a dairy ideal means do not count, even cow slaughter is resorted to for insuring cheap milk supply and getting rid of what are supposed to be uneconomic and superfluous cattle. Under the religious ideal means are the principal

thing — in fact everything. The essence of cow protection according to Hinduism thus does not lie in the mechanical act of 'saving' the animal *per se*, certainly not in saving it anyhow, but in the self-purification and penance behind the act. There is an episode in Kalidas's *Raghuvamsha* that brings out so clearly this significance of cow protection that I make no apology for sharing it with the reader.

The story runs that King Dilip of the famous Raghu line finding himself in his declining years without issue went to seek the advice of Sage Vasishtha, his preceptor, and was told that the attainment of his desire was prevented by a curse pronounced upon him by Surabhi, the Divine Cow, on account of an unintended insult that he had once offered to her, and that the only way to remedy it was to propitiate her by personally serving her and by protecting her against all harm in her roamings in the forest. So dismissing all his servants, the King entered upon his penance according to the sage's advice, 'offering her palatable mouthfuls of grass, rubbing her body, keeping off the gnats, following her as her shadow, halting where she halted, sitting down where she lay down, moving forth when she moved.' Thus protected the cow roamed about fearlessly in the jungle and such was the power of the King's penance and so all-conquering his love that even wild Nature felt its spell. 'When he entered the forest as its protector, forest conflagration would become extinguished even without any shower of rain; there appeared on the trees an abundant blossom and fruit and the *stronger animals no longer oppressed the weaker ones.*'

Thus it went on for 'thrice seven' days at the end of which, wishing to test the devotion of her protector, the cow entered a cave in the Himalayas near a cataract of the Ganga where grew tender grass, and was suddenly seized upon by a lion unnoticed by the King who was lost in contemplating the beauty and grandeur of the surrounding

mountain scenery. Startled from his reverie by the plaintive lowing of the cow, the King, ashamed of his absent-mindedness, fitted an arrow to his bow to shoot at the lion, but to his utter amazement and dismay felt himself held as if by a spell and all his strength paralysed. Seeing his helplessness the lion burst out into a loud pealing laugh and told him that all his prowess was vain, since he was not an ordinary lion but Kumbhodara, the servant of the god Shiva and was protected by the blessing of that god in consequence of which no arms could prevail against him : 'Do thou, therefore, abandon the hopeless attempt and return home. Thou hast proved thy devotion to thine trust. A warrior need feel no shame or humiliation in failing to protect a charge that cannot be protected by arms.' In line after line of rare eloquence and dramatic beauty the poet then goes on to describe the fierce internal struggle that follows in the mind of the King in which faith grapples with doubt and hope wrestles with despair. 'I know I am helpless,' replies the King, 'and therefore what I am going to say might appear ridiculous to thee, but one thing still remains to me. I offer my body to thee as ransom for the cow and I beseech thee to appease thy hunger on my flesh and let the cow go.'

The lion tries to move him from his resolve by a variety of arguments. 'If compassion is your motive,' he expostulates, 'then your decision is wrong, since by your death you will save only one cow, whereas if you live you will as their father ever protect your people against all troubles. If however, it is the displeasure of your preceptor that you are afraid of, you can allay it by presenting him crores of cows with ample and full udders as big as pitchers of water.' But this argument like the previous one is lost upon the King who once more presses his request. 'So be it,' replies the lion at last and the King laying down his arms throws himself before the wild beast 'like a lump of flesh,' so that it might make a meal of him. But lo and

behold, instead of the dreadful leap of the lion which he was expecting, flowers begin to shower from the heavens and he hears a gentle voice speak 'Rise up my son.' He gets up and finds the cow standing before him like his own mother, with milk overflowing from her udders and 'nowhere the lion!'

The King's ordeal is over. His staggering self-sacrifice has triumphed. The denouement is now revealed to him. The cow tells him that the lion that had seized her was only a delusive phantom created by her to test his faith, 'for through the power of the sage even the god of death has no power to strike at me.' And since the King has discharged his trust so nobly she grants him his wish. 'Do not think I can produce milk alone,' she says to him 'if pleased I can grant any wish.'

Dilip is here depicted as love incarnate. Faced with the dilemma whether to lay down his life to save the cow or to gain the merit of giving crores of cows in charity he unhesitatingly chooses the former and finds that he has thereby propitiated an angel unawares. His relentless pursuit of truth leads him to the discovery of the true way of cow protection — the way of *ahimsa*, of perfect love and therethrough everything else is added unto him.

Dilip's experience is capable of being repeated. For, the same problem confronts us today that confronted him. The cow whose service and protection is enjoined by Hinduism as a sacred duty is not cow, the animal merely, but cow that in our sacred lore appears as the personification of the 'agony of the Earth', and that pleads for redress before the Great White Throne whenever the Earth grows weary under its load of iniquity. Its service includes the service of the entire afflicted humanity, of all those 'who toil and suffer and are weary and need rest,' the service of *Daridra-narayan* whether incarnated as the 'living skeletons' of Orissa or the oppressed, down-trodden Pariah condemned

to a life of ignorance, privations and hardship by the self-righteous arrogance of the so-called higher classes.

It should be unnecessary to mention after this that this ideal cannot be served by cheap devices like that of inoculation, or by doing penance vicariously as in the case of giving short shrift to the would-be killer of the cow or by the mercenary method of investing a part of one's superfluous wealth in the purchase of cattle from slaughter-houses, but by following Dilip's way, the way of perfect love, — that tames even wild nature, and carries everything before it, — by self-suffering and self-purification. It is this spiritual ideal of cow protection that is exalted by Hinduism as the highest *dharma* and with reference to which the promise is held out :

न केवलानां पयसां प्रसूतिसवेहि मां कामदुघां प्रसन्नाम् ॥

'Do not think I can produce milk alone, if pleased I can grant any wish.'

[I commend this powerfully written article to the attention of every one who would know the inwardness of cow worship in India. M. K. G.]

Young India, 20-9-'28

COW SLAUGHTER

(By J. C. Kumarappa)

With an artisan the tool that he uses becomes almost an object of worship. In fact, in India we have a definite festival — *Shastra Pooja* — devoted to this ceremony. Man recognizes his economic dependence on the means of production. Just as an artisan depends on his tools, similarly the farmer depends on the cow and if we may extend the economic sphere, we may say that the cow, being the means of producing food, becomes the centre of the economic organization of man, especially in an agricultural country like India.

Apart from this aspect, when we look upon the cow as the producer of the bullock, the importance of the cow is enhanced. She now represents the centre of our economy. We may call our economic organization, where the cow contributes towards motive power, transport, food production, etc. a "cow-centred economy" in the same manner as England and certain other European countries were, not long ago, horse-centred economies.

During the last century England drifted from being a horse-centred economy into a coal-centred economy and from being a coal-centred economy she is fast moving into an oil-centred economy. These stages are very important to notice as the fate of the world itself depends on the source from which we obtain our power.

In the cow- and the horse- centred economies we have unlimited sources as we can breed as many bullocks and horses as we need and, therefore, there being no restriction on the number available, it does not arouse anybody's greed or jealousy, but coal and petrol being limited in their supply and quantity, uses of such sources of power

lead to friction amongst nations as the source dries up. It is now well recognized that these global wars are in no small measure due to different nations seeking to get control over oil fields. Hence, the coal and oil economies lead to conflict amongst nations. Unlike these two, the cow and horse economies are, comparatively, peaceful economies. Therefore, in a wider sense we may say that when we break through a cow-centred economy we are really causing cow slaughter, i.e. in other words, when our actions are inimical to the existence of the cow-centred economy, we are not in the company of the protectors of the cow. For example, when we use coal and oil as our source of motive power, we are really banning the cow from our economy. When we are making esphalted roads, which are not in the interests of animal traction, we are also guilty of breaking through the cow-centred organization. This aspect of the question is much more vital to us than the mere slaughtering of the four-legged and two-horned animal.

We wonder how many of our friends who stand up against cow slaughter can show their hands clean of bovine blood from the point of view of this higher interpretation of cow protection. The cow, like *khadi*, is symbolic of a way of life. Cow slaughter, therefore, would signify making impossible that way of life. We hope that those who stand for cow protection will realize the extensiveness of the cause which they stand for and will whole-heartedly support this wider application of the principle.

Harijan, 12-10-'47

REFORM OF PINJRAPOLS

(By William Smith)

It has been my privilege during my convalescence at Bangalore to pay regular visits to the Imperial Animal Husbandry and Dairy Institute, and to take there, what may be called, regular lessons. Mr William Smith, who is the Imperial Dairy Expert and Head of this Institute, and his assistants, have most carefully shown me the working of the Institute and the different departments into which it is divided. I trust I shall make use of the knowledge thus gained in conducting the dairying experiment at the Satyagraha Ashram on behalf of the All-India Cow Protection Association. As a result of several discussions with Mr Smith I asked him kindly to prepare for me notes on the working of *pinjrapols* and on methods of cattle-improvement in our villages, which he very kindly and promptly undertook to do. I am already in possession of two valuable notes. I give below his note on *pinjrapols*.

— M. K. G.

Some of the existing *pinjrapols* with more or less permanent and assured incomes are fairly well managed, and do provide a comfortable refuge for a certain number of cattle which have ceased to be economically useful in their old age. In many of these institutions it is however not an uncommon thing, when trade is bad and subscriptions are slow in coming in, to find cattle being kept in these places in a state of starvation which must mean great suffering to the animals and which eventually kills them. In cases like this instead of being a refuge for the animals the *goshala* becomes a cow killing institution, the method of killing being a cruel death by starvation. In at least six cases have I seen the cattle in *goshalas* being starved to death. The first thing then to be done with the existing *pinjrapols* is to see that they do not under any circumstances whatever admit to their shelters a larger number of animals than they can feed properly, house comfortably and take care of until they die a really natural death.

All the larger *pinjrapols* with an assured income, and which can command capital, should in my opinion be divided into three departments, the whole being managed by a trained dairy farm-manager.

1. The refuge department where old and economically useless cattle excluding buffaloes should be comfortably fed and cared for until they die naturally.

2. A dairy department where all cows sent to the *pinjrapols* to escape slaughter and capable of breeding and all other cows capable of bearing calves and yielding milk should be fed, housed and milked as a commercial dairy herd with careful milk recording, and the milk sold to the best advantage. The very best class of stud bulls should be used in this herd and all calves carefully reared, males not good enough for issue as stud bulls to be castrated and those considered good enough for breeding either transferred to the stud department or issued to villages as breeding bulls. All female stock to be reared as milkers and breeders. When the home-bred progeny of this department gets too numerous for the *pinjrapols* to deal with, they could be sold to reputable Hindu owners on the distinct understanding that they are to be returned to the refuge department of the *pinjrapols* when too old to work or milk.

3. A stud department where the very best of the right class of breeding bulls should be kept as stud for the use of the breeders in the district. The service of these animals could be given free for all cows passed by the expert manager as suitable for breeding with the *pinjrapol* animals and careful records of all servings kept. This department might also undertake the castration of all unsuitable animals in the district free of charge.

It is not necessary to take any specific steps to improve the quality of buffaloes. India cannot afford to keep any class of bovine which does not possess dual purpose qualities i.e. milk in the case of the female and draught in the case of the male. Generally speaking the male buffalo is unsuitable for field or cart work, and consequently unless the males except those required for stud purposes are slaughtered at birth, they remain an incubus in the country. The majority of the people in India do not approve of the killing of any kind of animals, and in any case it is not an economic proposition to rear and kill these animals for beef, as the value of this class of meat in India is far below cost of production.

The buffalo exists and increases in India owing to poor milking quality of the cows, and the aim of the cattle breeding propaganda ought to be so to increase the milk yielding capacity of all classes of cows, that they will not only provide sufficient milk to rear a strong

healthy calf, but in addition to this give as much milk as pay the cost of their feed. If and when we attain to this standard there will be no need for the buffalo which will be automatically eliminated by economic forces. The existing conditions prevailing in many parts of India today where a cultivator keeps two or three cows to rear bullocks from, and one or two buffaloes to provide milk and *ghi* for his household cannot continue. It is too costly and there is no reason whatever why the cows now kept for breeding should not in the future rear their calves and provide in addition all the milk and *ghi* required by the household. Our cattle have little or no beef value and we cannot afford to keep cows for draught cattle production and buffaloes for milk. The cow alone can and must do both duties. For these reasons the *pinjrapol* societies should confine themselves to caring for and improving the cow. Agriculture in India depends upon the efficiency of the cow as a bullock producer, not the buffalo; and the health of the people can be maintained and improved by the milk of the cow. In a sense the buffalo is an interloper introduced because of the poor milking qualities of the cow.

If all *pinjrapols* employed really qualified men capable of managing the *pinjrapols* on the foregoing lines, they could undoubtedly do a great work for India.

The reader will observe from the foregoing that Mr Smith has written with a knowledge of the existing *pinjrapols*. He told me that he has visited many of them. In his opinion the *pinjrapols* should serve the purpose not merely of being a home for aged and otherwise disabled cattle, but also for protecting the cow, and educating the people in the art of such protection. To that end they must have a properly equipped model dairy and a stud department. I add to these conditions a tannery department. I discussed with Mr Smith the question of adding tanneries. The idea appeared attractive to him, but being a specialist he naturally did not want to travel beyond his province. Mr Smith's cautious remarks about the buffalo are worthy of attention. He has not, and he cannot be expected to have the same feeling about animal slaughter, but he recognizes that in India any proposition suggesting slaughter of useless animals would be just as much out of place as a proposition for the destruction of aged and disabled parents

would be anywhere. He has, therefore, endeavoured to enter into the Hindu feeling as much as possible and suggested means of protection and conservation of cattle consistently with Indian traditions. I hope that managers of *pinjrapols* will study the suggestions made in Mr Smith's important note and make the necessary alterations in their management, which I am certain, can be made with very little extra cost in the beginning and with much profit in the end.

— M. K. G.

Young India, 14-7-'27

52

CATTLE IMPROVEMENT CO-OPERATIVE SCHEME

(By William Smith)

This week I give Mr Wm. Smith's note on a co-operative scheme for the improvement of village cattle. The *pinjrapol* scheme published in the issue of July 14th is capable of being enforced almost immediately, because the machinery is ready and only requires supplementary improvement, whereas the proposed scheme for the villages outside the *ghi*-producing tract and remote from cities is comparatively difficult of operation. But real improvement has to begin from these numerous villages, which on account of economic pressure and the ignorance of people in cattle breeding, helplessly become centres for slaughter-houses to draw upon. If a careful student were to study the movement of cattle that find themselves in the numerous slaughter-houses of India, he will find that agents, who know no principle save that of making money as fast as possible and anyhow, purchase cattle from these remote villages for the slaughter-houses. A *gosevak* is not easily made, certainly never for the wishing. He has to study his art as much as an engineer or a lawyer or a

doctor and has to take more pains than any of them. Mr Smith's scheme should, therefore, be studied by those who desire the welfare of cattle and of Indian villages with a view to putting it into operation in select villages. There is nothing sacrosanct about the scheme. It serves as a model for one who knows nothing about cattle-breeding or co-operative schemes. The chief thing is to make a beginning in the matter of education of villagers in cattle improvement. The proposed scheme is a help in that direction. Mr Smith promises a double increase in the value of cattle and the yield of milk if the scheme is properly worked.

— M. K. G.

Mr Smith's Scheme

(A note on the improvement of the cattle in a typical Indian village remote from a railway station with, say, 500 inhabitants and 50 to 100 adult cows and female buffaloes)

In a village of this class and size the total milk available after feeding calves would and should for some time to come be consumed in one form or another by the inhabitants of the village.

The whole of the cattle owners of the village should be formed into a Co-operative Cattle Improvement Society under the aegis of the Provincial Government Co-operative Department, each cattle owner taking shares in this society to the extent of say As. 4 per head of bovine stock of all ages belonging to him or her. This Co-operative Society should be controlled by a small executive committee of say 6 or 8 men elected by the shareholders on the principle of one member one vote. This executive committee should elect a chairman, an honorary secretary and an honorary treasurer, the chairman being of course a member of the executive committee, but the honorary secretary and treasurer need not necessarily be members of the committee.

Such a society would be of little use, unless at the commencement of its career especially, it could obtain and be guided by expert advice in regard to finance, records and technical cattle breeding, feeding and management, including cattle diseases. It should therefore be under the supervision of the local co-operative department as regards its organization, finance, accounts and audit, and it should be advised and assisted by the local agricultural and veterinary departments. All its records and accounts would be kept in the vernacular of the district. The work which this Society would set out to do in the order of urgency would be :

1. Make a survey and record all particulars of all the cattle in the village of all ages.

2. Arrange to have each bovine animal tattooed in the ear or branded with a number indicating the ownership of the animal.

3. Arrange with the assistance of the local agricultural department for the housing, feeding and supervision of one suitable stud bull for every fifty adult cows belonging to its members and further arrange to keep a careful record of the servings of each of these bulls.

4. Procure through the agency or with the approval of the local agricultural department suitable stud bulls as above, and issue public notice that they were available for service to members of the Society free and if considered desirable, to a limited number of non-members from outside areas at a fee.

5. Arrange with the local veterinary department for the castration of all male stock in the village with the exception of, say, one specially selected bull per 50 cows or buffaloes as a reserve for stud purposes. These reserve bulls to be purchased by the Society from their owners and housed and fed along with their stud bulls referred to in 4 above.

6. In consultation with the local agricultural department draw up a scheme for the growing, conserving and storing on a co-operative basis of fodder sufficient for the cattle of all members including fodder reserves.

7. Inaugurate a milk recording scheme, whereby the milk yield of the best cows and buffaloes belonging to the members of the Society could be recorded and authenticated. To do this, the Society could select the best milkers up to, say, half the total in milk and by means of honorary workers of repute, have each cow so selected milked in their presence one day each week during the lactation period of the animal. The quantities so recorded would be taken as the average daily yield for that week, and by multiplying each figure by seven, the total lactation yield ascertained with fair accuracy.

In calculating the amount of capital required, it has been assumed that the local Government would supply suitable stud bulls for half cost as is done by the Punjab and other Governments. The Society with the assistance of the local agricultural and veterinary departments and with its milk records as a guide decide as time went on, which males born to cattle owned by its members were to be castrated and which retained as stud bulls. Buffalo owners in villages should be encouraged to join the Co-operative Cattle Improvement Society and to gradually substitute cows for buffaloes as the milk yield of the former improved through careful breeding. Later on, when the

Society has to tackle the question of the disposal of the surplus milk of its members it should of course deal with the milk of both cows and buffaloes.

There are a hundred and one other directions in which this Society could and would extend its activities, but as it would have little or no income and merely exist for the benefit of the cattle owners of the village it would require to raise capital on which it would pay no interest. No money need be spent on interest to shareholders and the following is an estimate of the initial and recurring expenditure which such a Society would be called upon to incur :

Initial (Capital) Expenditure

Say 2 Stud Bulls @ Rs. 175/- each (half cost) ..	Rs. 350
1 Set Tattooing instruments	" 90
1 Reserve Bull local	" 60
1 Milk weighing machine for recording ..	" 150
Office furniture etc.	" 50
Total ..	Rs. 700

Recurring Expenditure Per Annum

Keep of three bulls for one year	Rs. 370
Pay of one attendant	" 150
Rent of Bull yard, say	" 60
Rent of room for office and Committee ..	" 50
Contingencies and miscellaneous	" 50
Casualties and condemnations in live stock (replacement of bulls)	" 100
Medicines etc.	" 20
Interest on capital say (to Bank)	" 50
Total ..	Rs. 850

Estimated Income Per Annum

By sale of manure	Rs. 40
By service fees from outsiders	" 10
Total ..	Rs. 50

Deduct income Rs. 50.

Total yearly cost of working, Rs. 800.

The raising of the necessary capital should not be a difficult matter, as the central co-operative bank would probably advance the moderate sum indicated on the personal security of the members of the executive committee jointly and collectively.

To meet the yearly recurring expenditure, the Society might ask the Agricultural or Co-operative Department of the local Government for a yearly grant equal to the amount which it would itself collect. This means that the Society would require to raise Rs 400 per annum. This would be done partly by asking for subscriptions from public-spirited citizens and by collecting from its members a cess of say As. 2 per bovine head per month. If there were 300 heads of cattle all told in the village this small cess would meet half the cost of running the Society.

If a Co-operative Society were honestly worked on these lines the value of the cattle and the yield of milk could, I think, be doubled in three generations, say ten years.

Young India, 4-8-27

53

CATTLE BREEDING

(By William Smith)

When I was convalescing in Bangalore two years ago, Mr William Smith, the Imperial Dairy Expert, gave me a precis of a statement he submitted to the Agricultural Committee in Poona. I extract from it the following valuable information and commend it to the attention of every one interested in the economic wellbeing of India.

— M. K. G.

“I think it is well in dealing with a subject like this to endeavour as far as possible to state:

1. The present condition of the industry,
2. Causes of existing conditions, and
3. Steps to be taken to improve existing conditions.

“As regards 1, I have now been in India for sixteen and a half years during the whole of which time I have been in very close touch with the cattle breeding industry in the Punjab, the United Provinces, Central Provinces, Sindh, Bombay and Madras, and

it is my considered opinion that in these parts of the country, the Punjab excepted, the quality of the cattle has declined since I came to India, or to put it more definitely, I believe that generally speaking, it is impossible in the open market today to procure in quantity, no matter what the price may be, as good draught bullocks and milch cows as were obtainable 16 years ago. Most certainly the quality of milch cattle available in India, including the Punjab but excepting the district of Sindh, is very much worse than those available 16 years ago. If that be so, it behoves us to look for the reason for such a decline at a time that practically every other country in the world has been able to improve the quality of its cattle; and the root reason undoubtedly is want of knowledge, accentuated by many circumstances, such as the spread of irrigation canals and conservation of forest lands with consequent diminution of grazing areas, the increased facilities for transport and consequent mixing of breeds or types, increased prices for human foodstuffs, and the erroneous idea that the development of dairying or milk production would injure the draught quality of working bullocks. I look upon it that the elimination of milking quantities in the stud bulls issued for breeding purposes and the idea that dairying or heavy milking qualities of dams are injurious to the qualities of plough cattle have probably done more harm to cattle breeding in India than anything else, because this elimination of milk giving qualities strikes at the root of the whole industry. So little attempt has been made to develop milking quality of most breeds of Indian cows that the dams even of some of the finest breeds of cattle are unable to suckle their young within a reasonable time, which means later maturity and fewer calves during the life time of the dam.

"In time past this did not matter so much, as great breeding areas were available which were useless for any other purpose, but these areas now grow cotton, or pulse, or wheat, and what must take their place? The ordinary cultivator must take their place, and to enable him to do this profitably he must have a cow which will give sufficient milk and *ghi* (clarified butter) for his family and at the same time rear a good draught bullock. As things are now, the cultivator in India keeps one or two or three cows which can hardly produce enough milk for their calves, and he keeps a female buffalo to give milk and *ghi* for his family. This female buffalo is quite unnecessary if the breeder can get a cow which will rear the calf and in addition provide the breeder with milk and *ghi*. Nothing is more certain than that the dam of any type or class of good working bullock whatever, can and ought to be a first class milker. We hear many people say that the solution of the cattle breeding problem is to grow more fodder,

but that is putting the cart before the horse. What we want is fewer but more efficient cattle. No country in the world can afford to keep a cow which is only capable of suckling a calf. The enormous increase in the number of buffaloes in India is the cause of the fodder shortage, because not only is the female buffalo used because the cow is such an inefficient milker, but the male buffalo is often permitted to survive. This male is useless for draught in most parts of the country, and between the female buffalo used because the cow is not as good a milker as she might be and the useless male buffalo the country is drained of its fodder to such an extent that there is not sufficient for any class of cattle.

"The solution of the whole matter lies in the dual-purpose animal. No matter what class or type of male plough bullock is required, the dam must always be a good milker and all bulls issued for stud purposes must be got from heavy milkers as well as be of the right size, type and class.

"This country can produce all the draught cattle it needs, more than all the dairy produce it can consume from much fewer cattle than we now possess, but they must be more efficient cattle and they must be dual-purpose every time. Any propaganda outside of dual-purpose efficiency is only perpetuating a great economic evil. No other basis can be profitable.

"If these are the reasons for the present state of affairs, then the first step to remedy matters is dairy education. In every civilized country in the world today dairying occupies a very prominent position in its Agricultural Department. The crying need of this country agriculturally is dairy education, both of the cultivator and the masses. Not only is the education of the man in the street necessary from the cattle breeding point of view, but it is necessary from the point of the health and general wellbeing of the people. The milk supply of our cities is probably the worst and most expensive in the whole world, which fact in itself is a proof of the crying need of the dual-purpose cow. We do not need beef and the country does not want it, but milk and draught we must have, and it is indisputable that these qualities can and must be combined in the cow of the future.

"In this note I, of course, have not touched on details of any kind but have confined myself to basic policy, because until we have our policy based on a sure economic foundation we can do nothing. The only practical and sound cattle breeding policy is dairying plus draught qualities; the one is hopeless without the other and both are inseparable."

This is a tremendous problem. The poverty of the

cow is reflected in the poverty of the people. The reader will note the emphasis put by Mr Smith upon two points. The milk producing quality of the cow does not affect her capacity for giving a proper draught animal. In Mr Smith's opinion based on long experience the two go together. The cow that gives a substantial quantity of milk will also give a substantial bullock. The second point made by Mr Smith is that whilst the buffalo may apparently do good to the individual, she kills the cow and therefore kills agriculture. Both these important things can only be handled by adequate education of those who own cattle. Of course if the State interested itself in the true welfare of the people as the States have done in many other parts of the world, the problem can be handled effectively inside of a few years, but private effort too can do a great deal to arrest the growing decay of our cattle which are becoming an economic burden instead of being as they ought to be a blessing.

— M. K. G.

Young India, 24-10-'29

54

OUR PINJRAPOLS

(By Y. M. Parnerkar)

Out of the many ways in which improvement of Indian cattle could be taken on hand, the re-organization of existing *pinjrapols* is one that claims attention. When India was rich in cattle and the struggle for existence was not so bitter these institutions had only to care for the sick and the old, but now as the times have changed, the work of these institutions does not lie in merely tending the diseased cattle but it must increasingly lie in the direction of improving the breed of cattle.

It is now an admitted fact that the best way to protect the cow is to raise her productive power both in milk and

draft. *Pinjrapols* can do this easily. They have all the needed facilities like capital and public sympathy. What they lack is scientific knowledge.

Pinjrapols always maintain a large number of animals of varying grades. A breeding herd could easily be made up from these by carefully selecting the cows and by mating them to well-bred bulls. Of the male progeny the very best calves should be raised for breeding and could be sent out for village cattle improvement. As far as possible the bulls in the village where these bulls are to be sent should be castrated or brought over to the *pinjrapols* to die a natural death so that they may not reproduce their kind. Other male calves of *pinjrapols* not needed for breeding should be castrated and sold out as bullocks. The well-bred females should be gradually added to the herd to raise the standard of efficiency. In case a *pinjrapol* does not possess good stock, good cows should be secured from big cities where generally dry animals are sent out to slaughter-houses. All the animals that are not up to the required standard and are found to be unfit for reproduction should be kept aside and their breeding stopped. These are to be maintained till they die a natural death.

When the milk standard of the breeding herd is raised to such an extent that the cows produce more milk than their calves need, a dairy should be established for the production of cheap and pure milk. This will add to the income of the *pinjrapol* and will go a long way to make it self-supporting.

With enough land and plenty of rich manure in the form of cowdung, urine, bones, etc. one could easily grow rich and cheap fodder and thus can keep the stock in a good condition. With the reduction of grazing areas and the rise in the prices of lands, fodder growing has to be taken up by every *pinjrapol*.

In some places a good lot of animal energy in the form of bullocks etc. is wasted, which could also be well utilized. The existing grazing areas also need a deal of improvement to produce more food at a lesser cost. Again with the breaking out of famines in any locality the rush of cattle increases towards the *pinjrapols*. So the *pinjrapols* should take to storing of large amounts of fodder that could be used during such seasons. A part of it may also be sold at reasonable rates to other people who cannot purchase fodder at very high cost. This will be of immense use to the local cattle keepers. There is no reason why an institution that has sufficient capital and rich grass barns cannot take this work on hand with ease.

The services of a skilled veterinary hand and a good stock of medicines will greatly add to the comforts of the live stock. The surgeon's services should be also lent to the public.

The carcasses of animals that die in the *pinjrapols* should be sent to a tannery, which can easily be maintained by the central *pinjrapol*.

It is well known that the working of these charitable concerns is in the hands of *mahajans* who have neither time nor energy to look into the details of management. On the other hand unemployment amongst educated youths is increasing every day. These two classes should co-operate together to make *pinjrapols* efficient institutions for cattle preservation and improvement. The youths have no doubt to receive the necessary training.

What is wanted then is enterprise and right line of work, and let us hope that trustees of *pinjrapols* will realize their responsibility.

Young India, 6-9-28

SAVE THE COW FROM TANNERS

(By Satish Chandra Das Gupta)

The demand for good hide by tanneries is an incentive to cow slaughter. The cow is slaughtered as much for her meat as for her hide. But there are places where the slaughter is solely for the hide. The meat there is a by-product and is disposed of at a very cheap price such as one pice per seer.

The Cottage Tanning Institute of Calcutta carries on tanning work but wants to protect the cow from being slaughtered and therefore restricts itself to naturally dead animals' hides. In the course of a search for dead cattle hides of good quality our workers went to Darbhanga, a place reputed for hides of quality. They brought the report that cows seldom die naturally in Darbhanga. The hide merchants got only five or ten per cent of the hides from dead animals, the rest are all from slaughtered ones.

It was difficult to believe this. But closer enquiry by me in Madhubani confirmed the first report. The hide merchants and *chamars* all agree that while ten hides may come from naturally dead animals, 90 hides are from slaughtered animals.

At Madhubani, cultivators have sharply separated the two functions of ploughing and milking. The cow is to do the ploughing and carting while the buffalo is to supply milk. The cow being reserved for supplying bullocks for the plough and the cart, the heifer is a surplus. A heifer is sold for as much as her hide is worth, namely four to six rupees each. The tanner's demand for substantial hide has been responded to by the hide merchants, the butchers and the owners of cattle, and the

heifers therefore, are largely slaughtered, only a few being left to propagate the race.

The buffalo is kept here simply for her milk. The male calf therefore is a surplus. These are not slaughtered because their hides do not bring much return. The male buffalo calves are regularly sold to traders who send them to Bengal where they are used for the plough and the cart. The Madhubani cultivator has kept half of a cow and half of a buffalo to make up for a complete animal for meeting his needs.

After the heifers, the dry cows and old and disabled bullocks come in the slaughtering line. Sakri is a small sleepy place in a corner of Darbhanga. There are two *hat* (bazaar) days in Sakri and on each day a hundred or more cows are bought for slaughter. 14 miles away from Sakri in the interior there is the Basauli *hat*. Here a much larger number of cows passes on to the butchers twice every week. And there are many *hats* and many slaughtering yards distributed over the villages, the population of which is mostly Hindu. The residents immediately in the neighbourhood of slaughtering places cannot consume the enormous quantities of meat. So this is hawked from village to village.

On my entering a cattle market, a butcher's agent at once felt that I was an inquirer. He came and without any question or introduction gave the information that all these cows (for slaughter) came from the Hindus. In a place where the population is very largely Hindu, such slaughter of cows is very tragic. Under the incentive of the demand for slaughtered hides for tanneries, may not also other places become like Madhubani? Madhubani is at once a menace and an eye-opener.

The establishment of a few tanneries where only dead cattle hides are handled will not touch the problem, nor will the establishment of *pinjrapols* serve the purpose.

Pinjrapols are object-lessons, but all the millions of cows cannot go there in old age to die. The owner, whether Hindu or Musalman, must be considering them uneconomical. Anyway, my belief is that the slaughter of the heifers has excited the slaughter of old cows and bullocks also. The heifer must save herself in order to save the older ones. She can save herself by being considered profitable. Legislation may do something by way of restricting slaughter. Musalmans may join hands with the Hindus in demanding such legislation because the slaughter of heifers under temptation is ruinous to both communities. But the chief factor in cow protection is the creation of demand for cow's milk and milk products. If such a demand is created a cow will be more economical than she is at present, and this will automatically stop slaughter of young cows and minimize the slaughter of old animals. And then a roused conscience of people may care to save all old animals.

If milk is obtained from the cow, the buffalo may not be needed at all at Darbhanga. They do not get much milk out of a buffalo at Darbhanga. Five seers a day is the quantity most generally obtained and a buffalo eats twice as much as a cow. A pair of cows may replace a buffalo.

The exporters buy any hides, good, bad and indifferent. But the first class Indian tanners manufacturing for export are keen about obtaining only the best quality of slaughtered hides. Slaughter of old animals would not meet their needs because such hides after tanning will fetch less than hides from youthful animals. This is a direct incentive to the slaughter of heifers and young cows. The position of cow slaughter, in my opinion, has become worse on account of the demand of the established tanneries of India which manufacture for export. If the number of Indian tanneries intended for export business increases, it will mean increased cow slaughter. From the report of the

Indian Hides Cess Committee the percentage of slaughtered hides may vary from 10 to 25 per cent of the total number of marketed hides in India. I believe that the percentage of slaughter has increased since.

We can make chrome patents from inferior leather also. If the Indian tanneries largely devote their attention to making chrome patent and if there is created a demand in India for patent leather shoes, then this tendency of increased cow slaughter may have a set-back. But the real thing is to make the cow so economical that it will be sold for much more than what its hide may be worth.

Harijan, 17-7-'37

56

GOSHALAS AND PINJRAPOLS

(Scheme of Sardar Datar Singh)

The following condensation from a scheme propounded by Sardar Sir Datar Singh will be of general interest.

— M. K. G.

It is estimated that there are at present 3,000 *goshalas* in the country with a population of over six lakhs head of cattle. These organizations, besides taking up the improvement of their institutions as envisaged by the Government of India, in the present threatened famine conditions can come to the country's help by production of more milk in the institutions. The number of well organized *goshalas* and *pinjrapols* can be taken as half i.e. 1,500. The cattle may be classified as:

1. Good Dairy type 20 per cent	1,20,000
2. Fair type — good for breeding, though not highly productive 20 per cent	1,20,000
3. Old, infirm and unfit for further breeding 60 per cent	3,60,000

It is the first and second class that could be exploited for milk production and breeding. Out of these 2,40,000, half will be milch and half dry.

Better feeding, management, organization, etc. would mean an increase in production of 1,20,000 seers or say 3,000 maunds of milk per day.

In order to achieve this end immediately, a skeleton plan is suggested below :

1. Productive animals should be separated from those that are aged, infirm or otherwise useless. The latter should be removed to rural areas, preferably to forest *rakhs* in order to relieve congestion and allow better feeding of productive cows. These cattle should not be allowed to propagate. Their care, as well as that of dry stock farms, may be in the hands of a committee.

2. For the achievement of this end, the stock should be divided in the following manner :

- a. Milch animals about to calve should be kept at the *goshala* premises.

- b. Dry animals fit for breeding should be kept on the lands, if any, belonging to the *goshala* in the neighbourhood or may be provided for at a place from where they could be returned when about to calve, and the animals which go dry in the *goshala*, should be sent there.

3. The congestion-relieved *goshalas* and *pinjrapols* will have enough space to house cattle properly, feed them scientifically and carry out other improvements.

4. To further help, encourage and stimulate these institutions in this direction, it is suggested to help them financially by giving them 50 per cent reduction on concentrates and fodder on the condition that these institutions will increase their milk production immediately, either by keeping milch cattle of the owners who are not able to keep them during the famine days, or by buying cattle where their finances permit. The Government will have the option of purchasing one-third of their milk supply for the needy people of the locality and in the neighbourhood, if required.

5. Attempts should be made to feed cattle more on feeds which are not generally required for direct human consumption such as oil-cakes, cotton seeds, etc.

6. It may also be stated here that by feeding by-products of grains to the cattle, not only can the production of available food be increased in the form of additional milk from these animals as compared to the food value of these by-products of food in case they are directly consumed, but it will also be a more economical method of using the latter. Within limits, it will have a double effect. It will help in the production of human food and will also protect the cattle from being underfed during the scarcity period.

7. All possible facilities should be provided for transport and supply of concentrates and other cattle-feeds to these institutions. Collection of data as to the requirements of the *goshalas* and the available stocks in these organizations should immediately be taken in hand. Provision should be made well in advance for the supply of these essential requirements from surplus to deficit zones. All this must be done in advance through Goshala Development Officers, who will be responsible for the working of the whole scheme.

The Sardar suggests to every province the appointment of Goshala Development Officers, training of workers and the supply of bulls. He rightly says that for real success there must be genuine co-operation between the Government and the public. He has no doubt that *goshalas*, humanitarian and Cattle Welfare and such other bodies will give the co-operation if approached.

Another friend of cattle writes as follows — M. K. G.

"I want you to consider one or two suggestions for saving our cattle during the coming famine as the shortage of fodder is likely to be acute in some of the famine-stricken areas. The world is familiar with 'Save the Children' campaigns. Why should we not in India inaugurate a 'Save the Cattle' campaign? Many of our good cattle were slaughtered as you know, during the war and we cannot afford to lose more through starvation.

"My concrete suggestion is that well-to-do people with plots of land on which grass is grown should be generous enough to permit cattle belonging to less fortunate people to graze in their compounds. They may not afford large-scale relief, since it would apply in the main to urban areas. Nevertheless, it is a point worthy of consideration.

"Provincial Governments should establish, a chain of *goshalas* where owners of cattle, who are unable to maintain them during the period of famine, may leave them to be fed and maintained at State expense until the crisis is over. Whether this should be done entirely free or if a fee should be levied from the owners and recovered later is a detail which the Provincial Governments may decide for themselves. It would be easier for Provincial Governments to make arrangements for the collective feeding of large numbers of cattle than the distribution of fodder to individual owners."

Harijan, 5-5-46

SARDAR DATAR SINGH'S SUGGESTIONS

(By A. K.) -

The following is the gist of a long article by Sardar Datar Singh. He says that inasmuch as India is primarily an agricultural country the improvement of cattle means nothing more nor less than the development of agriculture. India possesses over 29 per cent of the world's cattle population and yet the production of milk per capita is very low. It works out at 7 ounces per head per day here as against 56 and 45 respectively in New Zealand and Australia. 20 to 30 ounces per day is the minimum required according to dietary standards so that our output would have to be more than trebled. The average quantity of milk yield per cow per year is only 750 lbs. which too is sadly below standard. The root cause of this low yield is malnutrition. Against the total estimated annual requirements of 270 million tons roughage and 50 million tons of concentrates, only 175 and 3.75 million tons are available respectively. In addition, there is wastage in storing, drying, harvesting and preparation of food and fodder.

I. The Sardar makes the following suggestions in regard to proper feeding :

(a) The cultivation of fodder crops must be increased by encouraging cultivators to put more acreage aside for this purpose. The most nutritious and high yielding fodders should be cultivated and in addition a number of perennial grasses can be introduced, such as Elephant, Guinea, Rhodes as also leguminous crops, e.g. Berseem and various types of beans which make good mixtures with non-leguminous crops.

(b) The conservation of fodder crops and elimination of waste through silage, also improved methods of drying fodder.

(c) The provision of good and ample grazing areas. Grazing lands having diminished greatly in area, it is imperative to adopt some

system of controlled grazing on existing lands. Pastures available on canal banks can also be utilized with advantage.

In this connection, the Sardar emphasizes the importance of utilization of land under forests. It has been estimated that 107 million acres of land is under forests in India as compared to 362 millions of cultivated land. Very little use has been made of this vast forest wealth. For example, out of about 33 million head of cattle in the U.P., only about one million make any use of these grazing areas. The number of cattle in the whole of India is 97 million out of which $8\frac{1}{2}$ million only may be said to be using forest pasture lands. Plans are afoot which visualize doubling of the present forest area in terms of square miles of forest in British India. The theory that opening of forest areas will have a destructive effect on plantation is quite incorrect. Experiments have shown that grazing in itself when properly regulated is not only not an evil but will even "allow the vegetation to follow out its natural progress towards an ecologically higher type of plant community." The systematic planning of forest lands for grazing on economic and scientific lines is, therefore, a vital necessity.

II. The question of judicious breeding is of very great importance. For this the Sardar suggests :

(a) The supply to each area of a requisite number of bulls of a breed suited to the locality concerned. Caretakers should be appointed to put these animals in an enclosure in the evenings and the villages concerned should be responsible for their feeding. The caretakers should preferably be trained stockmen who can render first aid to the bulls as well as assist in case of cattle epidemics.

(b) The castration of undesirable bulls.

(c) An increase in the number of stud bulls which is ridiculously below India's requirements.

The need is at least one million and if these have to be replaced every four years as they should be, it means that a quarter of a million bulls have to be supplied every year. This would necessitate the maintenance on special

breeding farms of no less than 6,00,000 cows and 10,000 bulls, but as this is neither feasible nor economically sound, the Sardar suggests making full use of the existing organizations and institutions such as *goshalas* and *pinjrapols*. If properly reorganized, this could, at a very conservative estimate, provide 25,000 stud bulls annually as well as the same number of bullocks and 50,000 improved female calves every year.

III. The control of contagious diseases is of great import. Over 30 million cattle die annually from rinder pest, haemorrhagic, septicaemia, black quarter and anthrax. Strict attention should be paid both to preventive and curative measures. The average villager should not only be educated in the care of cattle but proper medical aid should be made available to him.

Harijan, 13-10-'46

58

COW BREEDING

(By Vinoba Bhave)

With Congress Ministries in the Provinces our responsibility for improving the condition of our cows and bullocks increases immensely. It is necessary that we should definitely chalk out the lines on which the work should now proceed. I offer some suggestions in this respect as well as in respect of cow-breeding in general.

1. As soon as the question of milk supply is considered, we start with the idea of importing cows giving plenty of milk. In my opinion this is not necessary. We should select for our work local breeds as far as possible. A little reflection will help to make my point clear. Our purpose cannot be served by ignoring local breeds. We cannot betray the agriculturists. It is essential that we should show them a way to improve the condition of the

cows that they have. It will be harmful to neglect these animals in our enthusiasm to supply milk to the cities.

2. It will be wrong to concentrate on the milk yielding quality of the cow and neglect its draught-strain. To have good bullocks for agriculture is one of the chief aims of breeding. To get good milk is another. Both these aims should well be kept in mind. We have to make the cow serve the dual purpose.

3. It is certainly no duty of the villages to supply milk to the cities. The village people should themselves drink plenty of milk and may sell only the surplus. This aim can be achieved only if milk in villages is so abundant that the villages find it within their means to drink plenty of it.

4. Agriculture, cow-breeding, oil-pressing by the bullock-ghani, tanning hides, and preparing good manures ; all these make one single unit and must go together. Agriculturists and their children will get sufficient milk only if all these industries are carried on together. In any scheme of cow-protection all these should be carried on simultaneously.

5. Cow-breeding cannot be separated from other village industries. If arrangement cannot be made to engage the agriculturist in essential industries in his own home, he will have to depend upon outside markets for his essential requirements and would be in need of cash to buy them. So long as this state of things continues, he will always have to sell his milk and milk products for cash.

6. The villagers need not purchase bullocks from outside. It should be possible to breed fine bullocks in every village. For this Government will have to provide proper facilities such as stud bulls. This should be considered as of primary importance.

These are the minimum conditions that I suggest for cow breeding.

INDEX

- AGRICULTURE, co-operative, 46
 Agriculturist, should be engaged in essential industries, 114
Ahimsa, 5; 6, 16, 17, 32; can convert Musalmans, 16; is a true way of cow protection, 89
 All India Cow Protection Association, 33; *pinjrapols* should be affiliated to, 43; was formed on 28-4-1925 and disbanded on 25-7-1928, 74
 Anti-Phooka Association, 10-11
 Apte, Dr. S. K., opines that cow's milk is superior to buffalo's, 58
- BAJAJ, JAMNALAL, 71
 Beef-eating, 13, 19, 38
 Bombay, should have only cow's milk supply, 62
 Branding, of cattle should be taboo, 69
 Bruen, opines cow's milk is superior to buffalo's, 58
 Buffalo, dry or barren—should be used for draught purposes, 51; how it is not an economical animal, 60-61; is cause of fodder shortage, 101; is kept simply for milk, which makes a male calf a surplus, 106; its breeding must be stopped, 52-54; its male progeny is useless for agriculture except in wet regions and therefore neglected, 62; its milk is almost unknown in Europe, 66; its milk is injurious to the development of children, 58; kills cow and therefore agriculture, 102; should be eliminated in interest of cow, 62; *v.* cow, 52-63
 Bullock, its tatooing, 97; its treatment by Hindus, 8
- CASTRATION, its method should be improved, 31
 Cattle, its improvement means development of agriculture, 111; uneconomic—cannot be saved, 36
 Cattle breeding, 96, 99-102; should be judicious, 112
 Cattle farming, collective, 44-47
 Cattle improvement, its methods, 92-95; its scheme for a village, 95-99
 Chrome, its patents can be made from inferior leather, 108
 Coal economy, leads to friction amongst nations, 91
 Constructive Programme, its continuous and sustained prosecution is necessary for cow protection, 23
 Co-operative Cattle Improvement Society, 96-97
 Cottage Tanning Institute, 105
 Cow, & her progeny can be saved only with certain limitations, 38; being kept only for bullocks makes heifer a surplus, 105; centre of Indian economy, 90; cruelties practised against, 7; dry or barren—should be used for plou-

ghing, 50-51; dual-purpose—alone would be able to protect herself, 61, 94, 101; for slaughter comes from Hindu custody, 14; good milch—is not available in market today in the same quantity as before, 100; greater number is killed for Englishmen than for Musalmans, 17; has a permanent place in Indian economy, 27; ideal of its protection is different in India from that in the West, 85; if scientifically protected,—would be more than an economic proposition, 31-32; includes all life that serves mankind, 73; is symbolic like Khadi of a way of life, 91; is worst in India of all the nations of the world, 8; its average quantity of milk per year is 750 lbs., 111; its deprivation would create serious handicap for the farmer, 59-60; its ghee is not inferior to buffalo's, 64; its milk has more hygienic & health-giving qualities than buffalo's, 53-54; its milk is useful for intellectual growth, 59; its milk should be cheaper and richer, 53; its milk supply should be increased, 93; its protection is possible only if buffalo is excluded, 63-64; its worship, 3, 30; makes agriculture possible, 4; rendered sterile by *phooka* is sent to butchers, 10; should be made economically impossible to be sold to the butcher, 25; *v.* buffalo, 45, 61-63, 66

Cow-breeding, should be done for dual purpose, 114; should be done with local breeds, 113; with agriculture, bullock-ghani, tan-

nery & manure-making, forms one unit which must go together, 114

Cow-centred economy, is Indian & is peaceful, 90

Cow-farming, collective—alone would save cow, 44-48

Cow protection, by *ahimsa*, 17; by latest scientific methods but with limitations prescribed by religious sentiment, 30; conditions for, 37-38, is central fact of Hinduism, 4; is Hinduism's gift to the world, 4; is more difficult than removal of foreign rule, 32; its chief factor is demand for cow's milk and milk products, 107; its wider meaning, 6; should not be attempted by violence, 13; supreme duty of a Hindu, 6, 29

Cow Protection Society, 71

Cow Service Association, is the only scientific society for effectively protecting cow, 17; would be against bringing physical force to bear on those communities whose religion does not prohibit, or regards as obligatory, cow slaughter, 72, 75; see Goseva Sangh

Cow slaughter, & State, 20-24; can be avoided if we start dairies & tanneries, 8, 34; can be made economically impossible, 21; Hindus are responsible for, 25; is only for hides at some places, 105; is resorted to in order to wound Hindus, 21; legislation against, 19; prohibition of—demanded by Hindus, 25-26

DAIRY, 33-34; & tannery, 33-34, 35-56; education, 101-02; scientific, 22, 34-35, 39

Dairying, or heavy milking qualities are not injurious to qualities of plough cattle, 100, 101

Das Gupta, Satish Chandra, 70

Datar Singh, Sardar, offers a scheme for protection, 108-13; opines keeping only cows without buffaloes is an economic proposition, 60

Denmark, has developed science of dairying, 53

Dilip, how king—served Surabhi, 86-89

ECONOMICS, humanitarian, 44; humanitarian—rules out profits & deficits, 40

FAECES, as cattle food, 67-68

Farmer, cannot hold out against adulterated ghee, 64

Fodder, 97, 100, 104, 109-12; should be stored for cattle of private owners, 103

Forest land, can be used as grazing land, 112

GANDHI, M. K., *passim*; advises Hindus to befriend Mussalmans with a view to save cow, 15; answers questions regarding cow protection, 41-43; asks Haripura Congress workers to arrange for only cow's milk & ghee 61; avers if cow dies, we also die, 12; believes cow protection is protection of the weak & helpless, 3, 6; believes if we breed buffalo, we cannot protect cow, 53; believes Indian civilization is non-violent & rural, 12; believes it unwise to coerce Muslims by legislation to submit to statutory prohibition of cow slaughter, 19; does not oppose legislation against cow

slaughter, 23; does not sympathize with attitudes of Hindus & Muslims regarding cow slaughter, 18; experiences greatest agony when cow is killed, 19; explains how true religion is adjusted with humanitarian economics, 40, 45; his ambition is to see the principle of cow protection established in the world, 19; his view of religion, 33; holds it is impossible to save both cow & buffalo, 53; is not opposed to legislation against cow slaughter, 20; on a scheme for dairies & tanneries, 35-36; on collective cow farming, 44-47; on cow protection, 3-5, on how to make cow slaughter economically impossible, 21; on ideal dairy, 34-35; on Koran's teaching regarding taking of life, 16; on scientific methods of cow protection, 29-31; on vegetable ghee, 64-65; on when a Hindu State can prohibit cow slaughter, 20; opines all profits should be utilized for buying cattle which are maimed, disabled and destined for slaughter, 37-38; opines buffalo should no longer be bred, 53; opines dry or barren cow or buffalo should be used for draught purposes, 49-51; opines *goshalas* should not take in buffaloes & goats, 38, opines Mysore is bound to undertake legislation against cow slaughter, 23; prefers to regard hides of dead cattle as sacred against those of slaughtered cattle, 37; says he cannot ask Government to stop cow slaughter, 25; says

he would neither kill a human being to save a cow nor would kill a cow to save a human being, 13; sees no escape from castration of bullocks, 68-69; suggests Calcutta Corporation should take charge of whole milk supply of the city, 11

Ghee, of guaranteed purity is not available, 65; real, 64-65

Gopalak Sangh, 56-59

Goseva Sangh, 73-76; duties of its members, 76-77; its constitution, 73-79; its resolutions, 80-81; *pinjarapols* working on Sangh's lines should obtain certificate from & affiliate themselves with, 81; published valuable literature on cow protection, 72; should investigate a harmless method of castration, 76

Goshala, 38, 48, 108-10; its ideal, 34-35; its present condition, 82; should be turned into model dairy & tannery, 37; what a reformed—should be like, 80-81; workers' training, 110; see *pinjarapol*

Grazing land, 45, 49, 76, 103, 112

Gujaratis, & Marwadis should devote their talents to preservation of cattle wealth, 27

HEIFER, is a surplus when a cow is kept only for bullocks, 105; must be made profitable, 107

Hides, 42; ninety per cent—from slaughtered animals, 105; their export should be stopped, 42; two—of unslaughtered cattle form subscription for Goseva Sangh, 73

Hindus, can save cow by developing faculty to die, 13; in the

absence of *ahimsa*—have become destroyers, instead of saviours of cow, 26-27, 32; should not use violence against Musalmans for cow protection, 13; should save cow by stealing into hearts of Muslims, 27; their responsibility for cow slaughter, 17-18, 26, 31, 49, 106

Horse economy, is peaceful, 91

Humanitarians, their three schools, 69

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE OF DAIRYING & ANIMAL HUSBANDRY, 24, 92

India, cannot afford to have a class of cattle which does not possess dual-purpose qualities, 93; exports cattle hides, 34; its agriculture depends upon efficiency of cow as a good milker & as a bullock-producer, 91; its cattle have little or no beef value, 94; its consumption of milk per head is 7 oz., 111; its people do not approve of killing any animal, 93; uses goods made out of hides of slaughtered cattle, 42

Indian Hides Cess Committee, 108

Indian Union, does not belong to Hindus alone, 27

KHILAFAT, 13, 16, 28

MANURE, 103, 114

Milk, cow's *v.* buffalo's, 56-59; its adulteration, 46; its supply in Indian cities is worst & most expensive in the whole world, 101; its yield per Indian cow as compared to cows of other nations, 32

Mohammed Ali, Maulana, 14

Muslims, might abstain from cow slaughter if Hindus do their part well, 31-32; their change of heart, 16

Mysore Cow Protection Committee, 20

PETROL, its production leads to friction among nations, 90-91

Phooka, 10-11

Pinjarapol, 9, 31, 75, 108-10; its organization would employ the unemployed, 104; its working, 92-95; lacks scientific knowledge, 31, 43, 103; should be a flourishing dairy, 9; should have model dairy & stud department, 94; should not admit cattle more than it can feed properly, 92; suggestions for its improvement, 80-81, 102-04; see *Goshala*

RAJENDRA PRASAD, is requested by Hindus to stop cow slaughter, 26

Religion, must help solve practical problems, 33; must satisfy humanitarian economics, 38

SAHASRABUDDHE, Prof., opines cow's milk is superior to buffalo's, 56-57

Satyagrahashram, 74; decides to have no more buffaloes, 54; its dairy accounts, 55

Shaukat Ali, Maulana, 16

Slaughter house, 95, 103; heifers, dry cows, old cows & disabled cattle are taken to, 106; villages supply cattle for, 95

Smith, William, 24, 92, 96-99

Stud bulls, 97, 98, 100, 110, 114

Surabhi, how—was worshipped by king Dilip, 85-89

TANNERY, 33-34, 76, 104; humanitarian, 43; prejudices against—should be removed, 72; scientific, 22, 39; should be with every *Goshala*, 42

VETERINARY HELP, 45, 97, 104

Village, is not bound to supply milk to cities, 114

Villager, his life is wrapped up with his cattle, 12

OTHER BOOKS
OF
GENERAL INTEREST

	Rs.nP.
A Philosophy of Indian Economic Development	2.50
A Preparation for Science	1.50
A Vision of Future India	0.75
Bal Gangadhar Tilak	7.00
Bhoodan Yajna	0.87
Christianity — Its Economy and Way of Life	1.25
Gandhi & Marx	1.00
Gandhian Techniques in the Modern World	1.00
Language Study in Indian Education	0.50
Mahatma Gandhi — The Last Phase, 2 Vols.	40.00
My Childhood with Gandhiji	2.50
Peaceful Industrial Relations	4.00
Planning for Basic National Recovery	0.75
Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, 2 Vols.	11.00
Satyagraha in Champaran	2.25
Search for Purpose	3.00
Seven Months with Mahatma Gandhi	4.00
Stray Glimpses of Bapu	2.00
The Gita according to Gandhi (Cardboard-bound)	4.00
(Paper-bound)	3.00
The Long Road	2.00
The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi	5.00
The Technique of Correlation in Basic Education	2.50
Which Way Lies Hope ?	2.00

Postage etc. extra

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

MY RELIGION

As Gandhiji's life consisted in seeking to practise his religion to the best of his ability, an attempt has been made in this volume to present to the reader extracts from his writings and speeches, which will give a fairly full picture of his religion.

Pages xii, 160

Price Rs. 2.00

Postage etc. 81 nP.

REBUILDING OUR VILLAGES

This booklet gives in an outline what Gandhiji, who had a very clear picture of what the villages required, wanted to be done for their reconstruction.

Pages v, 126

Price Re. 1.50

Postage etc. 37 nP.

BY SATISH C. DASGUPTA

THE COW IN INDIA

Vols. I & II

Gandhiji writes in the Foreword :

"I commend the volume to the lover of the cow as also to everyone who would learn that the slaughter of cattle for food is a pure economic waste and know how he can turn the cow into a giver of plenty instead of being the giver of scanty which owing to criminal negligence she has become today."

Pages lxiv, 1964

Price Rs.16.00

Postage etc. Rs. 2.25